Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BM646 .W255
Warburton, William. MAIN
The divine legation of Moses demonstrate
3 9967 00083 2043

Due Oct 7

Standard Works

IN

THEOLOGY, BIBLICAL CRITICISM, &c.

ACCESSION NUMBER 5253 SHELF NUMBER BM 646 W 255

The Virginia Library
McCormick
Theological Seminary
of the
Presbyterian Church, Chicago.

From the E. L. Bissell Fund.

RECEIVED

BUTLER'S (BISHOP) ANALOGY OF RELIGION,
With a Life of the Author, copious Notes and Index, by the Right Rev. W. Fitzgerald, D.D., Lord Bishop of Cork, &c., 8vo. cloth, 8s. 6d.

CALMET'S DICTIONARY OF THE HOLY BIBLE,
By Taylor, illustrated, 8vo. cloth, 15s.

CALVIN'S COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS,
3 vols. 8vo. cloth, 18s.

CAMPBELL'S (DR. GEORGE) LECTURES ON ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, 8vo. cloth, 6s.

W. Tegg & Co., 85, Queen Street, Cheapside, London.

NOT CIRCULATE

CAMPBELL'S (DR. G.) TRANSLATION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS, 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, 16s.

CARPENTER'S BIBLICAL COMPANION,
Imp. 8vo. cloth, 10s. 6d.

CLARKE'S (DR. ADAM) MISCELLANEOUS WORKS,
13 vols. 12mo. cloth, £2 5s. 6d.

CLARKE'S (DR. A.) SERMONS,
4 vols. 12mo. cloth, 14s.

COLE'S (ELISHA) PRACTICAL DISCOURSE OF GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY, fcp. 8vo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

CRUDEN'S CONCORDANCE OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS, imp. 8vo. cloth, 12s.

CUDWORTH'S INTELLECTUAL SYSTEM OF THE UNIVERSE, with a Translation of Mosheim's Notes, 3 vols. 8vo. cloth, £1 4s.

DIBDIN'S (REV. T. F.) SUNDAY LIBRARY,
With Portraits, 6 vols. fcp. 8vo. cloth, 16s.

DODDRIDGE'S FAMILY EXPOSITOR,
Imp. 8vo. cloth, 15s.

DWIGHT'S (DR.) SYSTEM OF THEOLOGY,
5 vols. 8vo. cloth, £1 7s.; or 5 vols. 18mo. cloth, 10s. 6d.

EDWARDS'S (REV. J.) DEVOTIONAL EXPOSITION OF THE BOOK OF PSALMS, 8vo. cloth, 4s.

ELLIS'S (DR. JOHN) KNOWLEDGE OF DIVINE THINGS, 12mo. cloth, 4s. 6d.

FARINDON'S (REV. ANTHONY, B.D.) SERMONS,
Life by Rev. T. Jackson, Indices, Translations, &c., 4 vols. 8vo. cloth, £1 16s.

FINNEY'S (REV. C. G.) LECTURES ON SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY, 8vo. cloth, 16s.

FLEURY'S MANNERS OF THE ISRAELITES,
Translated by Dr. Adam Clarke, 12mo. cloth, 3s. 6d.

GOODWIN'S (DR. JOHN) REDEMPTION REDEEMED,
New Edition, 8vo. cloth, 5s.

GOOD (J. MASON, M.D.) LIFE AND WRITINGS,
By Olinthus Gregory, L.L.D., fcp. 8vo. cloth, 3s.

GURNEY'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE,
24mo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

HERVEY'S (REV. JAMES) MEDITATIONS,
New Edition, 8vo. cloth, 3s. 6d.

HILL'S VILLAGE DIALOGUES,
With New Dialogues, and the Author's final Corrections, 12mo. cloth, 4s.

HORNE'S (BISHOP) COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS,
8vo. cloth, 7s.

W. Tegg & Co., 85, Queen Street, Cheapside, London.

THE

DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES

DEMONSTRATED.

BY THE RIGHT REVEREND

WILLIAM WARBURTON, D.D.,

LORD BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,

A DISCOURSE BY WAY OF GENERAL PREFACE:

CONTAINING SOME ACCOUNT OF THE LIFE, WRITINGS, AND CHARACTER OF THE AUTHOR.

BY RICHARD HURD, D.D.,

LORD BISHOP OF WORCESTER.

THE TENTH EDITION, CAREFULLY REVISED.

McCormick LIBRARY Theological Seminary

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THOMAS TEGG, 73, CHEAPSIDE.

MDCCCXLVI.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY JAMES NICHOLS,
HOXTON-SQUARE.

CONTENTS.

BOOK V. CONTINUED.

SECTION

Page.

V.—Shews, that as temporal rewards and punishments were the proper sanction of the Jewish Law, so, there were no other; Moses entirely omitting the Doctrine of a future state—That this omission was not accidental, but designed; and of a thing well known by him to be of high importance to Society—Proved from several circumstances in the book of Genesis,—and from the Law of punishing the crimes of Parents on their Posterity, which was to supply the want of the Doctrine of a future State—The nature and equity of this Law explained, and defended against Unbelievers—It is then shewn that as Moses taught not the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, so neither had the ancient Jews any knowledge of it—Proved from the books of the Old Testament 1

VI.—Proves the same point from the books of the New Testament—What notion the early Jews had concerning the Soul, explained 18

Appendix to the Fifth Book 28

Notes to the Fifth Book 51

BOOK VI.

Contains an Examination of all the Texts brought from the Old and New Testaments to prove a future State of Rewards and Punishments did make part of the Mosaic Dispensation 73

SECTION

I.—States the Question,—shews the Adversaries of this Work to have much mistaken it—And that the true state of the question alone is a sufficient answer to all objections 73

II.—Enters on an examination of the Texts brought from the Old Testament;—first from the book of Job—which is proved to be an allegoric Poem, written on the return from the Captivity, and representing the Circumstances of the People of that time—The famous words, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," &c. shewn to signify, in their literal sense, the hopes of a temporal deliverance only 78

III.—Contains an examination of the rest of the Texts urged from the Old Testament 131

IV.—Contains an examination of the Texts produced from the New Testament, in which the nature of the Apostolic Reasonings against the Errors of Jewish Converts is explained and illustrated 151

V.—The agreement of the Proposition of no future State in the Mosaic Dispensation, with the VIIth Article of the Church of England evinced—That the Old Fathers looked for more than transitory Promises, illustrated in the famous case of Abraham,—where it is proved that the command to offer Isaac was merely an information, in a representative Action instead of Words, of the Redemption of Mankind by the great Sacrifice of Christ—Shewn how this Interpretation overturns all the infidel objections against the truth of this part of Abraham's history 168

Page.

VI.—To support the foregoing Interpretation, The Original, Nature and Use of typical Rites and secondary Senses in Prophecies are inquired into—In the course of which Inquiry, the Principles of Mr. Collins's book concerning the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion are examined and confuted,—and likewise the Reasoning of Dr. Sykes against all double Senses of Prophecies in his book intituled, The Principles and Connexion of Natural and Revealed Religion, &c.—The Use and Importance of these Questions to the subject of The Divine Legation explained—The Conclusion of the argument,—with a recapitulation of it 199

Appendix concerning the Book of Job 267

Notes on the Sixth Book 273

BOOK IX.

Being an Attempt to explain the true Nature and Genius of the Christian Religion 321

Introduction 323

Chapter I. 338
——— II. 363
——— III. 393
——— IV. 407
——— V. 406
——— VI. 422

Notes on the Ninth Book 447

Index to The Divine Legation 479

Authors, &c. quoted in The Divine Legation: which Quotations are not referred to in the Index 501

McCormick LIBRARY Theological Seminary

THE

DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES

DEMONSTRATED.

CONTINUATION OF BOOK V.

SECTION V.

THUS we see that an EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE WAS THE NECESSARY CONSEQUENCE OF A THEOCRACY; and that this Providence is represented in Scripture to have been really administered. TEMPORAL REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, therefore, (the effects of this providence) and *not future*, MUST NEEDS BE THE SANCTION of their Law and Religion.

Having thus prepared the ground, and laid the foundation, I go on to shew that future Rewards and Punishments, which COULD NOT BE THE SANCTION of the Mosaic Dispensation, WERE NOT TAUGHT in it at all: and that, in consequence of this Omission, the PEOPLE had not the doctrine of a future state for many ages. And here my arguments will be chiefly directed against the believing part of my opponents; no Deist,* that I know of, ever pretending that the doctrine of a future state was to be found in the Law.

Moses delivered to the Israelites a complete Digest of Law and Religion: but, to fit it to the nature of a Theocratic Government, he gave it perfectly incorporated. And, for the observance of the intire Institution, he added the sanction of rewards and punishments: both of which we have shewn to be necessary for the support of a Republic: and yet, that civil Society, as such, can administer only one.†

Now in the Jewish Republic, both the rewards and punishments promised by heaven were TEMPORAL only. Such as health, long life, peace, plenty, and dominion, *&c.* Diseases, immature death, war, famine, want, subjection, and captivity, *&c.* And in no one place of the Mosaic Institutes is there the least mention, or any intelligible hint, of the rewards and punishments of another life.

* See note Y, at the end of this book. † *i. e.* Punishments. See the first vol. p. 118.

When SOLOMON had restored the integrity of Religion; and, to the regulated purity of Worship, had added the utmost magnificence; in his DEDICATION of the new-built Temple, he addresses a long prayer to the God of Israel, consisting of one solemn petition for the continuance of the OLD COVENANT made by the ministry of Moses. He gives an exact account of all its parts, and explains at large the SANCTION of the Jewish Law and Religion. And here, as in the writings of Moses, we find nothing but TEMPORAL rewards and punishments; without the least hint or intimation of a future state.

The holy PROPHETS speak of no other. Thus Isaiah: "Then shall he give the rain of thy seed that thou shalt sow the ground withal, and bread of the increase of the earth, and it shall be fat and plenteous; and in that day shall thy cattle feed in large pastures.—And there shall be upon every high mountain, and upon every high hill, rivers and streams of water." * And Jeremiah: "I will surely consume them, saith the Lord; there shall be no grapes on the vine, nor figs on the fig-tree, and the leaf shall fade, and the things that I have given them shall pass away from them.—I will send serpents and cockatrices amongst you, which will not be charmed, and they shall bite you, saith the Lord." † Nay so little known, in these times, was any other kind of rewards and punishments to the Jewish People, that, when the Prophets foretell that NEW Dispensation, by which, *life and immortality were brought to light*, they express even those future rewards and punishments under the image of the present. Thus Zechariah, prophesying of the times of CHRIST, describes the punishment attendant on a refusal of the terms of Grace, under the ideas of the Jewish Œconomy: "And it shall be that whoso will not *come up* of *all the families of the earth* unto *Jerusalem*, to worship the *King* the Lord of Hosts, even upon them SHALL BE NO RAIN." ‡ I would have those men well consider this, who persist in thinking "that the early Jews had the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments, though Moses taught it not expresly to them;" and then tell me why Zechariah, when prophesying of the Gospel-times, should chuse to express these *future* rewards and punishments under the image of the *present?*

Indeed, were it not for the amazing prejudices which have obtained on this subject, a writer's pains to shew that a future state of rewards and punishments made no part of the Mosaic Dispensation, would appear as absurd to every intelligent reader, as his would be who should employ many formal arguments to prove that Sir Isaac Newton's *Theory of Light and Colours* is not to be found in Aristotle's books *de Cœlo et de Coloribus*. I will therefore for once presume so much on the privilege of Common Sense, as to suppose, the impartial

* Isai. xxx. 23, 25. † Jer. viii. 13, 17. ‡ Zech. xiv. 17.

reader may be now willing to confess, that the doctrine of Life and Immortality was not yet known to a people while they were *sitting in darkness, and in the region and shadow of death;* * and go on to other matters that have more need to be explained.

II.

I shall shew then, in the next place, that this OMISSION was not accidental; or of a thing which Moses did not well understand: but that, on the contrary, it was a designed omission; and of a thing well known by him to be of high importance to Society.

I. That the doctrine of a future state of Rewards and Punishments was studiously omitted, may appear from several circumstances in the book of Genesis. For the history of Moses may be divided into two periods; from the Creation to his Mission; and from his Mission to the delivering up his Command to Joshua: The first was written by him in quality of HISTORIAN; the second, of LEGISLATOR; in both of which he preserves an equal silence concerning the doctrine of a future state.

1. In the history of the *Fall of Man* it is to be observed, that he mentions only the instrument of the agent, the SERPENT; not the agent himself, the DEVIL: and the reason is plain; there was a close connection between that agency,—The spiritual effects of the Fall,—the work of Redemption,—and the doctrine of a future State. If you say, the connection was not so close but that the Agent might have been mentioned without any more of his history than the temptation to the *Fall;* I reply, it is true it might; but not without danger of giving countenance to the impious doctrine of *Two Principles,* which at this time prevailed throughout the Pagan world. What but these important considerations could be the cause of the omission? † when it is so evident that the knowledge of this grand enemy of our welfare would have been the likeliest cure of Pagan superstitions, as teaching men to esteem of Idolatry no otherwise than as a mere diabolical illusion. And in fact we find, that when the Israelites were taught, by the later Prophets, to consider it in this light, we hear no more of their Idolatries. Hence we see, that the folly of those who, with *Collins,* would have a mere serpent only to be understood, is just equal to theirs who, with the *Cabbalists,* would have that serpent a mere Allegory.

2. In the history of Enoch's *translation* ‡ to Heaven,§ there is so studied an obscurity that several of the Rabbins, as Aben Ezra and Jarchi, fond as they were of finding a future state in the Pentateuch, interpret this translation as only signifying an immature death. *And*

* Matt. iv. 16. † See note Z, at the end of this book. ‡ Gen. v. 24.
§ Heb. xi. 5.

Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him. How different from the other history of the translation of Elijah? "And it came to pass when the Lord would take up Elijah into Heaven by a whirlwind, that Elijah went with Elisha from Gilgal, *&c.*—And it came to pass as they still went on and talked, that behold there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder, and Elijah went up with a whirlwind into Heaven."* But the reason of this difference is evident: When the latter history was written, it was thought expedient to make a preparation for the dawning of a *future state* of reward and punishment, which in the time of Moses had been highly improper. The reflections of an eminent Critic on this occasion, will shew how little he penetrated into the true design of this Œconomy. "Mirum est Mosem rem tantam, si modo immortalem Henochum factum CREDIDIT, tam obiter, tamque obscure, quasi EAM LATERE VELLET, perstrinxisse. Fortè cum hæc ex antiquissimis monumentis exscriberet, nihil præter ea quæ nobis tradidit invenit, quibus aliquid adjicere religio fuit."† For Moses both knew and *believed* the Immortality of Enoch, and purposely obscured the fact, from whence it might have been collected. But what is most singular in this reflection is, that the learned Commentator, to aggravate the obscurity, says it *is as obscure, as if he purposely designed to hide it,* supposing such a design to be the highest improbability; which was indeed the fact, and is the true solution of the difficulty.

3. In his history of the Patriarchs, he entirely omits, or throws into shade, the accounts of those Revelations, with which, as we learn from the writers of the New Testament, some of them were actually favoured, concerning the Redemption of mankind. Of these favours we shall give ere long a great and noble instance, in the case of ABRAHAM, who, as we are assured by JESUS himself, *rejoiced to see* CHRIST'S *day, and saw it, and was glad.*

From whence therefore could all this studied caution arise, but to keep out of sight that doctrine, which, for ends truly worthy of the divine Wisdom, he had omitted in his Institutes of Law and Religion? This shows the weakness of that evasion, which would reconcile the OMISSION, to the People's KNOWLEDGE of the doctrine, by supposing they had been so well instructed by the Patriarchs, that Moses had no occasion to say any thing farther on that subject.

Let me observe by the way, that these considerations are more than a thousand topical arguments to prove, that Moses was the real author of the book of Genesis. But the proof deduced therefrom will be drawn out and explained at large hereafter.

II. That the importance of this Doctrine to Society was well

* 2 Kings ii. 1, 11. † Vide CLERICUM in Gen. v. 24.

understood by Moses, may appear from a particular provision in his Institutes (besides that general one of an extraordinary providence), evidently made to oppose to the inconvenient consequences of the OMISSION.

We have shewn at large, in the first volume, that under a common or unequal providence, civil Government could not be supported without a Religion teaching a future state of reward and punishment. And it is the great purpose of this work to prove, that the Mosaic Religion wanting that doctrine, the Jews must REALLY have enjoyed that equal providence, under which holy Scripture represents them to have lived: and then, no transgressor escaping punishment, nor any observer of the law missing his reward,* human affairs might be kept in good order, without the doctrine of a future State.

Yet still the violence of irregular passions would make some men of stronger complexions superior to all the fear of *personal temporal evil*. To lay hold therefore on These, and to gain a due ascendant over the most determined, the punishments, in this Institution, are extended to the POSTERITY of wicked men; which the instinctive fondness of Parents to their offspring would make terrible even to those who had hardened themselves into an insensibility of personal punishment: *I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the Fathers upon the Children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me.*†

Now that this punishment was only to supply the want of a *Future state* is evident from hence:‡ Towards the conclusion of this extraordinary Œconomy, when GOD, by the later Prophets, reveals his purpose of giving them a NEW *Dispensation*,§ in which a Future state of reward and punishment was to be *brought to light*, it is then declared in the most express manner, that he will abrogate the Law of punishing Children for the crimes of their Parents. JEREMIAH, speaking of this *new* Dispensation, says: "In *those days* they shall say no more, The Fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the Children's teeth are set on edge: but every *one shall die for his own iniquity*, every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge. Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a NEW COVENANT with the House of Israel,—NOT according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt,"‖ *&c.* And EZEKIEL, speaking of the same times, says: "I will give them one heart, and will put a NEW spirit within you, *&c.*—But as for them, whose heart walketh after the heart of their abominable things—*I will recompense*

* See note AA, at the end of this book. † See note BB, at the end of this book. ‡ See note CC, at the end of this book. § See note DD, at the end of this book. ‖ Jer. xxxi. 29—33.

their way UPON THEIR OWN HEADS, saith the Lord God." * And again: "What mean ye, that you use this Proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The Fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the Children's teeth are set on edge? † As I live, saith the Lord God, Ye shall *not have occasion any more to use this Proverb in Israel.* Behold all souls are mine; as the soul of the Father, so also the soul of the Son is mine: *the soul that sinneth, it shall die.*" ‡

And yet (to shew more plainly that the *abrogation* of the Law was solely owing to this *new* Dispensation) the same Prophets, when their subject is the *present* Jewish Oeconomy, speak of this very Law as still in force. Thus JEREMIAH: "Thou shewest loving kindness unto thousands, and *recompensest the iniquity of the Fathers into the bosom of their Children* after them." § And HOSEA: *Seeing thou hast forgotten the Law of thy God, I will also forget thy Children.*" ‖

From all this I conclude, That, whoever was the real Author of what goes under the name of the *Law of Moses*, was at least well acquainted with the *importance* of the doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment; and provided well for the *want* of it.

But the blindness of Infidelity is here most deplorable. The Deists are not content with condemning this Law of injustice, but will accuse the Dispensation itself of inconsistence; pretending that the Prophets have directly contradicted Moses in their manner of denouncing punishment.

It is indeed the standing triumph of infidelity. *But let us return* (says SPINOZA) *to the Prophets, whose discordant opinions we have undertaken to lay open.—The* xviiith *chap. of* EZEKIEL *does not seem to agree with the* 7th ver. *of the* xxxivth *chap. of* EXODUS, *nor with the* 18th ver. *of the* xxxiid. chap. of JEREMIAH, *&c.*¶—"There are several mistakes" (says TINDAL) "crept into the Old Testament, where there's scarce a chapter which gives any historical account of matters, but there are some things in it which could not be there originally.—It must be owned, that the same spirit (I dare not call it a spirit of cruelty) does not alike prevail throughout the Old Testament; the nearer we come to the times of the Gospel, the milder it appears: for though God declares in the Decalogue, that he is *a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the parents upon the children to the third and fourth Generation*, and accordingly Achan, with all his family, was destroyed for his single crime; yet the Lord afterwards

* Ezek. xi. 19—21. † See note EE, at the end of this book. ‡ Ezek. xviii. 2—4. § Jer. xxxii. 18. ‖ Hosea iv. 6. ¶ "Sed ad Prophetas revertamur, quorum discrepantes opiniones etiam notare suscepimus.—Cap. saltem xviii. Ezech. non videtur convenire cum versu 7 cap. xxxiv. Exod. nec cum ver. 18 cap. xxxii. Jer." &c.—*Tract. Theologico-Pol.* pp. 27, 28.

says, *The soul that sinneth it shall die; the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father,*"* &c.†

I. Let us see then what these men have to say on the first point, the *injustice of the Law.* They set out on a false supposition, that this method of punishment was part of an universal Religion given by God as the Creator and Governor of mankind: whereas it is only part of a civil Institute, given by him to *one People,* as their *tutelary God* and *civil Governor.* Now we know it to be the practice of all States to punish the crime of Lese Majesty in this manner. And to render it just, no more is required than that it was in the compact (as it certainly was here) on men's free entrance into Society.

When a *guilty* Posterity suffered for the crimes of their Parents, they were deprived of their natural unconditional rights; when an *innocent,* they only forfeited their conditional and civil: But as this method of punishment was administered with more lenity in the Jewish Republic, so it was with infinitely more rectitude, than in any other. For although God allowed capital punishment to be inflicted for the crime of *lese majesty,* on the *Person of the offender,* by the delegated administration of the Law; yet concerning his *Family* or *Posterity* he reserved the inquisition of the crime to himself, and expressly forbid the Magistrate to meddle with it, in the common course of justice. *The Fathers shall not be put to death for the Children, neither shall the Children be put to death for the Fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin.*‡ And we find the Magistrate careful not to intrench on this part of God's jurisdiction. We are told, that as soon as Amaziah the son of Joash king of Judah became firmly established in the throne, *He slew his servants which had slain the King his Father. But the* CHILDREN *of the murderers he slew not: according unto that which is written in the book of the law of Moses* [Deut. xxiv. 16.] *wherein the Lord commanded saying, The Fathers shall not be put to death for the Children, &c.*§ Yet such hath been the perversity or stupidity of Freethinking, that this very text itself hath been charged with contradicting the xxth chapter of EXODUS. Now God's appropriating to himself the execution of the Law in question would abundantly justify the equity of it, even supposing it had been given by him as part of an *universal religion.* For why was the Magistrate forbidden to imitate God's method of punishing, but because no power less than omniscient could, in all cases, keep clear of injustice in such an inquisition?

But God not only reserved this method of punishment to himself, but has graciously condescended to inform us, by his Prophets, *after what manner* he was pleased to administer it. YOUR INIQUITIES

* "Christianity as old as the Creation," pp. 240, 241. † See note FF, at the end of this book. ‡ Deut. xxiv. 16. § 2 Kings xiv. 5, 6.

(says he) AND THE INIQUITIES OF YOUR FATHERS TOGETHER, *which have burnt incense upon the mountains, and blasphemed me upon the hills: therefore will I measure their former work into their bosom.** And again: "But ye say, Why? doth not the Son bear the iniquity of the Father? When the Son hath done that which is lawful and right, and hath kept all my statutes, and hath done them, he shall surely live.—But when the Righteous turneth away from his righteousness and committeth iniquity—shall he live?"†

So much for that case in which the Posterity were *iniquitous*, and suffered punishment, in the strict and proper sense of the word. But doubtless, an innocent Posterity were sometimes punished, according to the denunciation of this Law, for the crimes of their wicked Fathers;‡ as is done by modern States, in attaint of blood and confiscation: and this, with the highest equity in both cases.

In our Gothic Constitutions, the throne being the fountain of honour and source of property, *Lands* and *Titles* descend *from it*, and were held as FIEFS *of it*, under perpetual obligation of military and civil services. Hence the LAWS OF FORFEITURE for high treason,§ the most violent breach of the condition on which those *fiefs* were granted. Nor was there any injustice in the forfeiture of what was acquired by no natural right, but by civil compact, how much soever the confiscation might affect an innocent posterity.

The same principles operated under a Theocracy. God supported the Israelites in Judea, by an extraordinary administration of his providence. The consequence of which were great temporal blessings to which they had no natural claim; given them on condition of obedience. Nothing therefore could be more equitable than, on the violation of that condition, to withdraw those extraordinary blessings from the Children of a Father thus offending. How then can the Deist charge this Law with injustice? since a Posterity when *innocent* was affected only in their civil conditional rights; and, when deprived of those which were natural and unconditional, were always guilty.

From all this it appears, that the excellent GROTIUS himself had a very crude and imperfect notion of the whole matter, when he resolved the justice of it intirely into God's sovereign right over his creatures. "Deus quidem in lege Hebræis data paternam impietatem in posteros se vindicaturum minatur: sed ipse Jus Dominii plenissimum habet, ut in res nostras, ita in vitam nostram, ut munus suum, quod sine ulla causa et quovis tempore auferre cuivis, quando vult, potest."‖

II. As to the second point, the charge of *Contradiction in the Dis-*

* Isai. lxv. 7. † Ezek. xviii. 19, 24. And see note GG, at the end of this book.
‡ This appears from the rise of that proverb in Israel, *The Fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the Children's teeth are set on edge.* § See note HH, at the end of this book. ‖ *De Jure Belli et Pacis*, vol. ii. p. 593, ed. Barbeyrac, Amst. 1720.

pensation, we now see, that, on the contrary, these different declarations of God's manner of punishing in two so distant Periods, are the MOST DIVINE INSTANCE of constancy and uniformity in the manifestations of eternal Justice: So far are they from any indication of a *milder or severer Spirit*, as Tyndal with equal insolence and folly hath objected to Revelation. For while a *future state* was kept hid from the Jews, there was absolute need of such a Law to restrain the more daring Spirits, by working on their instincts; or, as Cicero expresses it—"ut caritas liberorum amiciores Parentes Reipublicæ redderet." But when a doctrine was *brought to light* which held them up, and continued them after death, the objects of divine justice,* it had then no farther use; and was therefore reasonably to be abolished with the rest of the judicial Laws, peculiar to the Mosaic Dispensation. But these men have taken it into their heads (and what comes slowly in, will go slowly out) that it was repealed for its *injustice;* though another reason be as plainly intimated by the Prophets, as the circumstances of those times would permit; and so plainly by JEREMIAH, that none but such heads could either not see or not acknowledge it. In his thirty-first chapter, foretelling the advent of the NEW Dispensation, he expressly says, this Law shall be revoked: IN THOSE DAYS *they shall say no more, The Fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the Children's teeth are set on edge. But every one shall die for his own iniquity.*† Yet, in the very next chapter, speaking of the OLD Dispensation, under which they then lived, he as expressly declares the Law to be still in force. *When I had delivered the evidence of the purchase unto Baruch, I prayed unto the Lord, saying,—Thou shewest loving kindness unto thousands, and recompensest the iniquity of the fathers into the bosom of their Children after them.*‡ Is this like a man who had forgot himself? or who suspected the Law of cruelty or injustice?

But the ignorance of Free-thinking was here unaffected; and indeed the more excusable, as the matter had of old perplexed both Jews and Christians. The Synagogue was so scandalized at EZEKIEL's Declarations against this mode of punishment, that they deliberated a long time whether he should not be thrown out of the Canon, for contradicting MOSES in so open a manner.§ And Sentence had at last past upon him, but that one *Chananias* promised to reconcile the two Prophets. How he kept his word, is not known, for there is nothing of his

* See note II, at the end of this book. † Jer. xxxi. 29, 30. ‡ Jer. xxxii. 16, 18. § "Les Juifs disent qu'Ezechiel etoit serviteur de Jérémie, et que le Sanhedrin delibera long-tems, si l'on rejetteroit son Livre du Canon des Ecritures. Le sujet de leur chagrin contre ce Prophete vient de son extreme obscurité, et de ce qu'il enseigne diverses choses contraires à Moise—Ezechiel, disent-ils, a declaré, *Que le fils ne porteroit plus l'iniquité de son pere*, contre ce que Moise dit expressement, *Que le Seigneur venge l'iniquité des Peres sur les Enfans, jusqu'à la troisieme et quatrieme generation.*"—CALMET, *Dissert.* vol. ii. p. 361.

extant upon the subject; only we are told that he approved himself a man of honour, and, with great labour and study, at length did the business.*

ORIGEN was so perplexed with the different assertions† of these two Prophets, that he could find no better way of reconciling them than by having recourse to his *allegorical* fanaticism, and supposing the words of the first to be a Parable or Mystic speech; which, however, he would not pretend to decipher. This learned Father, having quoted some pagan Oracles intimating that Children were punished for the crimes of their Forefathers, goes on in this manner: "How much more equitable is what our Scriptures say on this point? *The Fathers shall not be put to death for the Children, neither shall the Children be put to death for the Fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin,* DEUT. xxiv. 16, *&c.*—But if any one should object that this verse of the oracle,

"*On the Children's Children and their Posterity;*

is very like what Scripture says, that GOD *visits the iniquity of the Fathers upon the Children unto the third and fourth Generation of them that hate him,* EXOD. xx. 5. he may learn from *Ezekiel* that those words are a PARABLE; for the Prophets reprove such as say, *The Fathers have eaten sour Grapes, and the Children's teeth are set on edge;* and then it follows: *As I live, saith the Lord, every one shall die for his own sins only.* But this is not the place to explain what is meant by the PARABLE of *visiting iniquity unto the third and fourth generation.*"‡ There could hardly be more mistakes in so few words. The two texts in Deuteronomy and Exodus, which Origen represents as treating of the same subject, treat of subjects very different: the first, as we have shewn above, concerns the Magistrate's execution of the Law; the other, that which God reserves to himself. Again, because the text of Exodus apparently occasioned the Proverb mentioned by Ezekiel and Jeremiah, therefore by a strange blunder or prevarication, the Father brings the Proverb in proof that the Law which gave birth to it, was but a Proverb or *parable* itself.§

II.

We have now shewn that MOSES did not teach a future state of reward and punishment; and that he omitted it with design; that he

* See note KK, at the end of this book. † Exod. xx.; Ezek. xviii. ‡ Ὅρα δὲ ὅσῳ τούτου βέλτιον τὸ, Οὐκ ἀποθανοῦνται, &c. ἐὰν δέ τις ὅμοιον εἶναι λέγῃ τῷ,

Ἐς παίδων παῖδας οἳ καὶ ὄπισθεν γένωνται,

τὸ, Ἀποδιδοὺς ἁμαρτίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα, ἐπὶ τρίτην καὶ τετάρτην γενεὰν τοῖς μισοῦσί [με·] μαθέτω, ὅτι ἐν τῷ Ἰεζεκιὴλ παραβολὴ τὸ τοιοῦτον εἶναι λέλεκται, αἰτιωμένῳ τοὺς λέγοντας, Οἱ πατέρες ἔφαγον ὄμφακα, καὶ οἱ ὀδόντες τῶν τέκνων ἠμωδίασαν· ᾧ ἐπιφέρεται, Ζῶ ἐγὼ, λέγει Κύριος, ἀλλ' ἢ ἕκαστος τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀποθανεῖται. Οὐ κατὰ τὸν παρόντα δὲ καιρόν ἐστι, διηγήσασθαι τί σημαίνει ἡ περὶ τοῦ τρίτην καὶ τετάρτην γενεὰν ἀποδιδόσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας παραβολή.—*Contra Celsum*, p. 403. § See note LL, at the end of this book.

understood its great importance to society; and that he provided for the want of it. And if we may believe a great Statesman and Philosopher, "Moses had need of every SANCTION that his knowledge or his imagination could suggest to govern the unruly people, to whom he gave a Law, in the name of God." *

But as the proof of this point is only for the sake of its consequence, that *therefore the people had not the knowledge of that doctrine*, our next step will be to establish this consequence: Which (if we take in those circumstances attending the *Omission*, just explained above) will, at the same time, shew my argument in support of this *Omission* to be more than *negative*.

Now though one might fairly conclude, that the People's not having this Doctrine, was a necessary consequence of Moses's not teaching it, in a Law which forbids the least addition † to the written Institute; yet I shall shew, from a circumstance, the clearest and most incontestable, that the Israelites, from the time of Moses to the time of their Captivity, had not the doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment.

The BIBLE contains a very circumstantial History of this People throughout the aforesaid period. It contains not only the history of public occurrences, but the lives of private persons of both sexes, and of all ages, conditions, characters and complexions; in the adventures of Virgins, Matrons, Kings, Soldiers, Scholars, Merchants, and Husbandmen. All these, in their turns, make their appearance before us. They are given too in every circumstance of life; captive, victorious; in sickness, and in health; in full security, and amidst impending dangers; plunged in Civil business, or retired and sequestered in the service of Religion. Together with their Story, we have their Compositions likewise. Here, they sing their triumphs; there, their palinodia. Here, they offer up to the Deity their hymns of praise; and there, petitions for their wants: here, they urge their moral precepts to their Contemporaries; and there, they treasure up their Prophecies and Predictions for posterity; and to both denounce the promises and threatenings of Heaven. Yet in none of these different circumstances of life, in none of these various casts of composition, do we ever find them acting on the motives, or influenced by the prospect of future rewards and punishments; or indeed expressing the least hope or fear, or even common curiosity concerning them. But every thing they do or say respects the present life only; the good and ill of which are the sole objects of all their pursuits and aversions.‡

* BOLINGBROKE'S "Works," vol. v. p. 513. † Deut. iv. 2; xii. 32. ‡ See note MM, at the end of this book.

Hear then the sum of all. The sacred Writings are extremely various both in their subject, style, and composition. They contain an account of the Creation, and Origine of the human race: the history of a private Family, of a chosen People, and of exemplary men and women. They consist of hymns and petitions to the Deity, precepts of civil life, and religious Prophecies and Predictions. Hence I infer that as, amidst all this variety of writing, the Doctrine of a future state never once appears to have had any share in this People's thoughts; it never did indeed make part of their Religious opinions.* And when, to all this, we find their *occasional* reasoning only conclusive on the supposition that a future state was not amongst the Religious doctrines of the People, the above considerations, if they needed any, would receive the strongest support and confirmation. To give one example out of many. The Psalmist says, *For the rod of the Wicked shall not rest upon the lot of the Righteous: lest the Righteous put forth their hands unto iniquity.*† That is, "God will vigorously administer that *extraordinary Providence* which the nature of the Dispensation required to be administered, lest the Righteous, not seeing themselves exempt from the evils due to wickedness, should conclude that there was no moral Governor of the world; and so, by making their own private interest the rule of their actions, fall into the practice of all kind of iniquity." But this could never be the consequence where an unequal dispensation of Providence was attended with the knowledge and belief of a future state. And here I will appeal to those who are most prejudiced against this reasoning. Let them speak, and tell me, if they were now first shewn some history of an old Greek Republic, delivered in the form and manner of the Jewish, and no more notice in it of a future state, Whether they could possibly believe that the Doctrine was National, or generally known in it. If they have the least ingenuity, they will answer, They could not. On what then do they support their opinion here, but on religious Prejudices? Prejudices of no higher an original than some Dutch or German System: for, as to the BIBLE, one half of it is silent concerning *life and immortality;* and the other half declares that the doctrine was *brought to light through the Gospel.*

But to set this argument in its fullest light. Let us consider the History of the rest of mankind, whether recorded by Bards, or Statesmen; by Philosophers, or Priests: in which we shall find the *doctrine of a future state* still bearing, throughout all the various circumstances of human life, a constant and principal share in the determinations of the Will. And no wonder. We see how strong the Grecian world thought the sanction of it to be, by a passage in

* See note NN, at the end of this book. † Psalm cxxv. 3.

Pindar, quoted by Plutarch in his tract of *Superstition*, where he makes it one circumstance of the superior happiness of the Gods, over men, that they stood not in fear of Acheron.

But not to be distracted by too large a view, let us select from the rest of the Nations, one or two most resembling the Jewish. Those which came nearest to them (and, if the Jews were only under human guidance, indeed extremely near), were the SUEVI of the north, and the ARABS of the south. Both these People were led out in search of new Possessions, which they were to win by the sword. And both, it is confessed, had the doctrine of *a Future state* inculcated unto them by their leaders, ODIN and MAHOMET. Of the Arabs we have a large and circumstantial history: Of the Suevi we have only some few fragments of the songs and ballads of their Bards; yet they equally serve to support our Conclusion. In the large history of the Saracen Empire we can scarce find a page, and in the Runic rhymes of the Suevi scarce a line, where the doctrine of a future state was not pushing on its influence. It was their constant Viaticum through life; it stimulated them to war and slaughter, and spirited their songs of triumph; it made them insensible of pain, immoveable in danger, and superior to the approach of death.* For, what Cicero says of Poetry in Rome, may be more truly applied to the Doctrine of a Future state amongst these Barbarians: "Ceteræ neque temporum sunt, neque ætatum omnium, neque locorum. Hæc studia adolescentiam alunt, senectutem oblectant, secundas res ornant, ADVERSIS PERFUGIUM AC SOLATIUM PRÆBENT." †

But this is not all. For we find, that when a future state became a popular doctrine amongst the Jewish People (the time and occasion of which will be explained hereafter) that then it made as considerable a figure in their Annals, by influencing their determinations,‡ as it did in the history of any other people.

Nor is it only on the silence of the sacred Writers, or of the speakers they introduce, that I support this conclusion; but from their positive declarations; in which they plainly discover that there was no popular expectation of a future state, or Resurrection. Thus the woman of Tekoah to David: *For we must needs die, and are as water spilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered up again.*§ Thus Job: *As the cloud is consumed, and vanisheth away: so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more.*‖ And again: "There is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again—though the root thereof wax old in the earth, and the stock thereof die in the ground, yet through the scent of water, it will bud and bring forth

* See note OO, at the end of this book. † *Pro Archia Poeta*, sect. 7. ‡ See the second book of Maccabees. § 2 Sam. xiv. 14. ‖ See note PP, at the end of this book.

boughs like a plant. But man dieth and wasteth away: yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fall from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up: so man lieth down and riseth not till the Heavens be no more, they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep." * Here the Jewish Writer, for such he was, as shall be shewn hereafter (and might, indeed, be understood to be such from this declaration alone) opposes the revival of a *vegetable* to the irrecoverable death of a rational *animal*. Had he known as much as St. Paul, he had doubtless used that circumstance in the *vegetable* world (as St. Paul did) to prove analogically, the revival of the rational *animal*.

The Psalmist says, *In death there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave who shall give thee thanks?* † And again: *What profit is there in my blood, when I go down to the pit? Shall the dust praise thee, shall it declare thy truth?* ‡ And again: "Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead? Shall the dead ARISE and praise thee? Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave, or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" §

The writer of the book of Ecclesiastes is still more express: *For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a* REWARD, *for the memory of them is forgotten.* ‖

Hezekiah, in his song of Thanksgiving for his miraculous recovery, speaks in the same strain: "For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I do this day: The father to the children shall make known thy truth." ¶

Lastly Jeremiah, in his *Lamentations* and complaints of the people, says, OUR FATHERS HAVE SINNED AND ARE NOT, AND WE HAVE BORN THEIR INIQUITIES.** Which implies, that the fathers being dead bore no part of the punishment of their sins, but that all was thrown upon the children. But could this have been supposed, had the People been instructed in the doctrine of future rewards and punishments?

Yet a learned *Answerer*, in contradiction to all this, thinks it sufficient to say, That "these passages may imply no more than that the dead cannot set forth God's glory *before men*, or make his praise to be known *upon earth*." †† Now I think it must needs *imply* something more, since the *dead* are said to be unable to do this under the earth as well as upon it. For it is the *Grave* which is called the

* Job xiv. 7—12. † Psalm vi. 5. ‡ Psalm xxx. 9. § Psalm lxxxviii. 10—12. ‖ See note QQ, at the end of this book. ¶ Isai. xxxviii. 18, 19. ** Lam. v. 7. †† DR. STEBBING'S "Exam." &c. p. 64.

land of forgetfulness, or that where all things are forgotten. And in another place it is said, *The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence.** Surely, a plain intimation that all intercourse of praise between man and his Maker ceased on death, as well below ground as above; otherwise why did the sacred writer tell us it was the *Grave* which was the place of *silence* to the dead? If the Answerer's interpretation be right, *this world,* and not the other, was the place. Had the Psalmist supposed, as the Doctor does, that the *dead* continued in a capacity of *remembring the goodness of God,* this remembrance could be no where more quickly or forceably excited than in that World where the divine goodness is clearly unveiled to *the spirits of just men made perfect?* † On the contrary, the *Grave* is uniformly represented by all of them, as the *land of darkness, silence, and forgetfulness.*

But since, of all the sacred writers, the Psalmist is he who is supposed by the adversaries of the Divine Legation to have most effectually confuted the Author's system, I shall quote a passage from his hymns, which, I think, fairly enough decides the controversy.—Hitherto we have only heard him say, that the *dead forget God;* we shall now find him go further, and say that *God forgets them.*—"I am counted with them that go down into the pit.—FREE amongst the dead, like the slain that lie in the grave, *whom thou rememberest no more:* and THEY ARE CUT OFF FROM THY HAND." ‡ Let the serious reader take notice of the last words, *they* (the dead) *are cut from thy hand,* i. e. they are no longer the object of thy Providence or moral Government. On this account it is, that in the beginning of the sentence he calls these *dead* FREE; that is, manumised, set at liberty; in the same sense that Uzziah the leper's *freedom* is spoken of by the sacred historian.—*And Uzziah the King was a Leper, and dwelt in a several house* [or, as the margin of our translation tells us, it signifies in the Hebrew, a FREE HOUSE or *house of freedom*] *being a Leper, for he was* CUT OFF *from the house of the Lord.* The phrase of *cutting off,* &c. signifying the same in both places, the taking away all intercourse and relation between two: And if that intercourse consisted in *service* on the one side, and protection on the other, as between Lord and Subject, Master and Servant, he who owed *service* is with great propriety of figure said to be FREE or MANUMISED. Hezekiah, as quoted above, delivers the very same sentiment, though in a different expression—*they that go down into the pit cannot hope for* THY TRUTH. What this *truth* is, the following words declare,—*the living, the living, they shall praise thee.* THE FATHER TO THE CHILDREN SHALL MAKE KNOWN THY TRUTH. As much as to say, "the *truth* not to be hoped for by

* Psalm cxv. 17. † Heb. xii. 23. ‡ Psalm lxxxviii. 4, 5.

them who go down into the pit, is *The nature and history of God's Dispensation to his chosen people;*" in which, by a particular precept of the LAW, the Fathers were commanded to instruct their Children. Thus the Psalmist and this other Jewish Ruler agree in this principle, that the Dead are no longer the object of God's *general* Providence, or of his *particular:* which evinces what I was to prove, "THAT THE BODY OF THE EARLY JEWS HAD NO EXPECTATIONS OF A FUTURE STATE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS." And here let me take notice of a passage which the contenders for the contrary Doctrine much confide in. It is where David, speaking of his dead child, says, *I shall go to him, but he will not return to me.* But whither was he to follow his departed child? He himself tells you—into a land of *darkness, silence, and forgetfulness,* where he was to be no longer in a capacity of *remembring the goodness and mercy of God,* or even of *being remembered by him;* but was to be *cut off from his hand,* that is, was to be no longer the object of his Providence or moral Government.

To proceed. If now we set all these passages together, we find it to be the same language throughout, and in every circumstance of life; as well in the cool philosophy of the author of Ecclesiastes, as amidst the distresses of the Psalmist, and the exultations of good Hezekiah.

But could this language have been used by a People instructed in the doctrine of life and immortality? or do we find one word of it, on any occasion whatever, in the Writers of the New Testament, but where it is brought in to be confuted and condemned? *

All this, to thoughtful men, will, I suppose, be deemed convincing. Whence it follows that their subterfuge is quite cut off, who pretend, that Moses did not indeed propagate the Doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments in *writing,* but that he delivered it to TRADITION, which conveyed it safely down through all the ages of the Jewish Dispensation, from one end of it to the other. For we see, he was so far from teaching it, that he studiously contrived to keep it out of sight; nay provided for the want of it: and the people were so far from being influenced by it, that they had not even the idea of it. Yet the writers of the Church of Rome have taken advantage of this silence in the Law of Moses concerning a future state, to advance the honour of TRADITION: For, not seeing the doctrine in the WRITTEN LAW, and fancying they saw a necessity that the Jews should have it, they concluded (to save the credit of the Jewish Church and to advance the credit of their own) that Moses had carefully inculcated it, in the TRADITIONAL. This weighty point, Father Simon proves by the *second book of Maccabees;* and triumphs over

* "*Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.* Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners," &c. (1 Cor. xv. 32, 33.)

the Protestants and Socinians (as he calls them) for their folly in throwing that book out of the Canon, and thereby disabling themselves from proving a future state, from the Old Testament.*

A very worthy protestant Bishop does as much honour to *Tradition*, in his way. In some *Miscellanies* of the Bishop of Cloyne, published in 1752, we find these words—"Moses, indeed, doth *not insist on a future state*, THE COMMON BASIS OF ALL POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS. —The belief of a future state (which it is manifest the Jews were possessed of *long before the coming of Christ)* seems to have obtained amongst the Hebrews from primæval TRADITION, which might render it unnecessary for Moses to *insist* on that article."† Though the Bishop has not the merit of saying this with a professed design, like Father Simon, *pour appuyer la Tradition*, yet the Church of Rome has not the less obligation to him for assigning so much virtue to this their powerful assistant, which has conveyed to them all they want; and indeed most of what they have. But if the *traditional* doctrine of a future state prevailed amongst the Jews, in the time of Moses, and that he would trust to the same conveyance for the safe delivery of it down to the times of Christ, how came it to pass that he did his best to weaken the efficacy, by studiously contriving to draw men off, as it were, from the Doctrine, and always representing it under the impenetrable cover of temporal rewards and punishments?

2. If a future state obtained by *Tradition*, What occasion was there for the Law of punishing the transgression of the parent upon the children?

3. If it obtained by *Tradition*, How happened it that the Jews are not represented in their History sometimes at least, as acting on the motives, and influenced by the prospect of a future state, and expressing their hopes concerning it like the rest of mankind, who had it by *Tradition*, or otherwise?

4. If it obtained by *Tradition*, How came HEZEKIAH to say, that *they who go down into the pit cannot hope for the truth:* and DAVID, to represent the dead as going into the place of *silence* and *forgetfulness*, where they were no longer to praise and celebrate the goodness of God? On the contrary, are there not passages in the books of SOLOMON and JOB, which plainly shew that no such tradition obtained in their respective times?

5. If it obtained by *Tradition*, What occasion for the administration

* "Mons. Simon avoit dit, *pour appuyer la Tradition*, que la resurrection des corps ne peut se demontrer par le Vieux Testament—ces expressions plus claires de la resurrection et du siecle à venir, qui se trouvent dans le *second Livre des Maccabees*, sont une preuve evidente que les Juifs avoient une Tradition touchant la Resurrection, dont ils n'est fait aucune mention dans les anciens livres de l'Ecriture. Les Protestans et les Sociniens qui ne reçoivent point les *Maccabees* ne pourront pas la prouver solidement par le Vieux Testament."—PERE SIMON, *Reponse au Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande, &c.* p. 39. † Page 68.

of an extraordinary Providence under the Law? Or from whence arose the embarras of DAVID and JEREMIAH (not to speak of the disputants in the book of JOB) to account for the prosperity of some wicked Individuals, in the present life? In a word, to the maintainers of this *Tradition* may be very appositely applied the words of Jesus to the *Traditionists* in general, when he told them, *they made the word of God of none effect through their traditions.* For certainly, if any thing can render that *word of God* which *brought life and immortality to light by the Gospel,* of none effect, it is the pretended PRIMÆVAL TRADITION which the good Bishop so much insists upon.

The learned Prelate indeed observes, that *the Jews were possessed of a future state long before the coming of Christ.* But what is this to the purpose, if it can be shewn, that the knowledge of it might be obtained from a quarter very distant from the old Hebrew *Traditions;* and especially if from the colour and complexion of the Doctrine, it can be shewn, that it did, in fact, come from a distant quarter? namely, from their Pagan neighbours; patched up out of some dark and scattered insinuations of their own Prophets, and varnished over with the metaphorical expressions employed to convey them. But not to anticipate what I have to say on this head in the last volume, I proceed in the course of my argument.

SECTION VI.

WHAT is yet of greatest weight, the inspired writers of the *New Testament* expressly assure us that the doctrine of a future State of reward and punishment did NOT make part of the Mosaic Dispensation.

Their evidence may be divided into *two* parts. In the first, they prove that *temporal* Rewards and Punishments were the sanction of the Mosaic Dispensation: and in the second, that it had NO OTHER.

I. St. PAUL, in his epistle to Timothy, enforcing, against certain judaizing Christians, the advantages of moral above ritual observances, says, "Bodily exercise profiteth little; but godliness is profitable unto all things; having the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come."* That is, though numerous ritual observances were enjoined by the Law, and some there must needs be under the Gospel wherever there is a Christian Church, yet they are of little advantage in comparison of moral virtue; for that, under both Religions, the rewards proper to each were annexed only to *godliness:* that is to say, under the Jewish, the reward of *the life that now is;* under the Christian, of that *which is to come.* This interpretation, which shews *temporal rewards* to be foreign to the nature of the Christian Oeconomy, I support,

1. From other passages of the same Writer, where he expressly

* 1 Tim. iv. 8.

informs us that Christians have not the promise of the *life that now is*. For to the Corinthians he says, speaking of the condition of the followers of CHRIST, *if in this life only we have hope in* CHRIST, *we are of all men most miserable.** To understand the force of which words, we must consider, that they were addressed to Jewish Converts tainted with Sadducism, who argued from the Mosaic Dispensation to the Christian: And holding that there was no future state in the former, concluded by analogy, that there was none in the latter. The argument on which they built their first Position was, that the sanctions of the Law were temporal rewards and punishments. Our Apostle therefore argues with them, as is his usual way, on their own principles. "You deny," says he, "a resurrection from the dead, or a future state of reward and punishment. And why? Because there is no such doctrine in the Law. How do you prove it? Because the sanctions of the Law are temporal rewards and punishments. Agreed. And now on your own principle I confute your conclusion. You own that the Jews had an equivalent for future rewards and punishments, namely the present. But Christians have no equivalent. So far from that, *they are*, with regard to this world only, *of all men most miserable;* having therefore no equivalent for the rewards of a future state, they must needs be entitled to them." This shews the superior force of the Apostle's reasoning. And from hence it appears not only that Christians HAD NOT, but that the Jews HAD the promise of the life that now is.

2. If we understand the *promise of the life that now is* to extend to the Christian Dispensation, we destroy the strength and integrity of St. Paul's argument. He is here reasoning against judaizing Christians. So that his business is to shew, that *godliness*, in every state, and under every Dispensation unto which they imagined themselves bound, had the advantage of *bodily exercise*.†

The author of the epistle to the Hebrews, speaking of JESUS, says: *After the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another Priest, who is made not after the* LAW OF A CARNAL COMMANDMENT, *but after the power of an endless life.*‡ The Jewish Religion, called a *carnal commandment*, is here opposed to the Christian, called *the power of an endless life*. By *carnal commandment* then must needs be understood a Law promising carnal things, or the things of this life.

II. That the Mosaic Dispensation had ONLY the sanction of *temporal* rewards and punishments, or that it taught not *future*, let us hear St. John; who in the beginning of his Gospel assures us, that *the* LAW *was given by Moses, but* that GRACE *and* TRUTH *came by Jesus Christ*.§ As certain then as the *Law* did not come by Jesus

* 1 Cor. xv. 19. † See note RR, at the end of this book. ‡ Heb. vii. 15, 16. § John i. 17.

Christ, so certain is it, according to this Apostle, that *Grace* and *Truth* did not come by Moses. This *Grace* and *Truth* cannot be understood generically; for, the *grace* or favour of God was bestowed on the chosen race, and *truth*, or the revealed will of God, *did come* by Moses. It must therefore be some *species* of *grace* and *truth*, of which the Apostle here predicates; the publication of which species constitutes what is called the Gospel. And this all know to be redemption from death, and restoration to eternal life.

Again, to this part likewise, let us once more hear the learned Apostle: *As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: for until the Law, sin was in the world, but Sin is not imputed where there is no Law. Nevertheless Death reigned from Adam to Moses.** It is St. Paul's purpose to shew, that *death* came by ADAM through sin, and so passed upon all men; and that *life* came by JESUS CHRIST: But having said that Sin, which brings forth Death, is not imputed where there is no Law, lest this should seem to contradict what he had said of Death's passing upon *all men*, he adds, *nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses;* taking it for granted that his followers would understand it must needs reign from Moses to CHRIST, as having made *Sin's being* IMPUTED to consist in there being a LAW given. Now I ask how the Apostle could possibly say, *that Death reigned under the* Mosaic Dispensation, if that People had the knowledge of immortal life to be procured by a Redeemer to come, any more than it can be said to *reign now* with the same knowledge of a Redeemer past; since we agree that the efficacy of his death extends to all preceding as well as succeeding Ages? Accordingly in his epistle to the Corinthians he calls the Jewish Law, the MINISTRATION OF DEATH, and the MINISTRATION OF CONDEMNATION.†

2. In his epistle to the Galatians, he says,—*Before* FAITH *came, we were kept under the Law, shut up unto the* FAITH *which should afterwards be revealed*;‡ i. e. we were kept in subjection to the Law of Moses: and, by that means, shut up and sequestered from the rest of the Nations, to be prepared and made ready for the first reception of the FAITH, when it should in God's appointed time be revealed unto men. From these words therefore it appears, that till that time, the Jews had no knowledge of this FAITH. So much we must have concluded though he had not said, as he does afterwards, That till that time, the Jews *were in bondage under the elements of this world.*§ Now could men acquainted with the doctrine of *life and immortality* be said, with any sense of propriety, to be in such a state of bondage? For though men in bondage may have an idea of Liberty, yet of THIS

* Rom. v. 12, et seq. † 2 Cor. iii. 7, et seq. ‡ Gal. iii. 23. § Gal. iv. 3.

LIBERTY they could have no idea without understanding, at the same time, that they were partakers of its benefits.

3. In his second epistle to Timothy he expressly says, *That* JESUS CHRIST HATH ABOLISHED DEATH, AND HATH BROUGHT LIFE AND IMMORTALITY TO LIGHT THROUGH THE GOSPEL.* But now if *Death* were abolished by JESUS CHRIST, it is certain it had reigned till his coming: and yet it is as certain, that it could reign no longer than while the tidings of the Gospel were kept back; because we agree that CHRIST's death hath a retrospect operation: therefore those under the Law had no knowledge of life and immortality. Again: *If life and immortality were brought to light through the Gospel,* consequently, till the preaching of the Gospel, it was kept hid and out of sight.† But if taught by Moses and the Prophets, it was *not brought to light through the Gospel:* therefore the generality of those under the Law had no knowledge of a future state. But Scripture is ever consistent, though men's systems be not. And for this reason we find that *life and immortality,* which is here said to be *brought to light through the Gospel,* is so often called the MYSTERY OF THE GOSPEL:‡ that is, a *mystery* till this promulgation of it by the disciples of CHRIST: *Which had been hid from ages and from generations, but was then made manifest unto the Saints.*§ The term was borrowed from those famous *Rites* of Paganism, so named; and is applied with admirable justness. For as the *Mysteries* were communicated only to a few of the wise and great, and kept hid from the populace: so *life and immortality,* as we shall see, was revealed by GOD, as a special favour, to the holy Patriarchs and Prophets, but kept hid from the body of the Jewish Nation.

4. The Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says: That THE LAW MADE NOTHING PERFECT, BUT THE BRINGING IN OF A BETTER HOPE DID.‖ Now, that could not be said to be *brought in,* which was there before. And had it been there before, the *Law,* it seems, had been perfect; and, consequently, would have superseded the use of the *Gospel.* Therefore this *better hope,* namely of immortality in a future state, is not in the Mosaic Dispensation. Let us observe farther, that as the Gospel, by bringing in a *better hope,* made the Law *perfect,* it appears, there was that relation betwen the *Law* and *Gospel* which is between the beginning and the completion of any matter. From whence these two consequences follow: 1. That the Law wanted something which the Gospel supplied: And what was that something but the doctrine of a future State? 2. That the Law must needs make some preparation for that *better hope* which the Gospel was to bring in. What it was, the same writer tells us, namely, That *it had* A SHADOW

* 2 Tim. i. 10. † See note SS, at the end of this book. ‡ See note TT, at the end of this book. § Col. i. 26. ‖ Heb. vii. 19.

[σκιὰν] *of good things to come,* but *not the* VERY IMAGE [εἰκόνα] *of the things.** Hence it is evident that by this *shadow* is meant such a typical representation, so faintly delineated, as not to be perceived by vulgar eyes, intent only on a carnal Dispensation. This was contrived for admirable purposes: For if, instead of a *shadow* or faint outline of a design, the Image itself, in full relief, had glaringly held forth the object intended, this object, so distinctly defined, would have drawn the Jews from that Oeconomy to which it was God's pleasure they should long continue in subjection: And had there been no delineation at all, to become stronger in a clearer light, one illustrious evidence of the Dependency between the two Religions had been wanting.

Again, the same Writer, to the same purpose, speaking of CHRIST says, *But now hath he obtained a more excellent Ministry, by how much also he is the Mediator of a* BETTER COVENANT, *which was established upon* BETTER PROMISES. *For if the first Covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been found for the Second.*† 1. We see that this *better Covenant* was established by CHRIST, and not by Moses. 2. If the first Covenant had been faultless, that is, had contained *better promises,* or taught the doctrine of a future state, there had been no room for a second.

To sum up all, This admirable writer gives in the last place, the fullest evidence to both parts of the proposition, namely, "That temporal rewards and punishments were the sanction of the Jewish Dispensation; and that it had no other." For in the second chapter we find these remarkable assertions.

Ver. 2. *For if the word spoken by Angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience* RECEIVED A JUST RECOMPENCE OF REWARD, *How shall we escape, &c.*

Ver. 5. *For unto the Angels hath he not put in subjection the* WORLD TO COME, *whereof we speak.*

Ver. 14, 15. *He* [Christ]*also himself likewise took part of the same* [flesh and blood] *that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death; that is, the Devil; and deliver them, who through fear of Death were* ALL THEIR LIFE-TIME *subject to bondage.*

Let us lay these three texts together. And we shall find, 1. from ver. 2. that the sanction of the Law, or *the word spoken by angels,* was of a temporal nature—*every transgression received a just recompence.* 2. From ver. 5. that the Law taught no future state—*the world to come not being put in subjection to these angels.* And 3. from ver. 14, 15. that the people had not the knowledge of such a state—*being all their life-time subject to bondage.* For the Devil is here said to have *power of death,* as he brought it into the world by

* Heb. x. 1. † Heb. viii. 6, 7.

the delusion of the FIRST MAN. Therefore, before *death* can be abolished, *He*, who had the power of it, must be destroyed. But his destruction is the work of the SECOND MAN. Till his coming therefore, the Jews, as we are here told, *were through fear of death all their life-time subject to bondage.* Christ then brought them into *the glorious liberty of the children of God,** by setting before them *life and immortality.*†

To all this, I hope, the reader will not be so inattentive to object, "That what is here produced from the New Testament to prove that the followers of the Law had no future state, contradicts what I have more than once observed, That the later Jewish Prophets had given strong intimations of an approaching Dispensation, with a future state." For the question is concerning a future state's being the Sanction of the LAW, not of later intimations, of its being ready to become the sanction of the GOSPEL.

As inconsiderate would be this other objection, "That my point is to prove that this Dispensation had *no future state of reward and punishment at all*, and my evidence from the New Testament only shews they had not the *Christian Doctrine of it.*" For to this I answer, 1. That those I argue with, if they hold any difference between the Christian and general Doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment, it is only this, that the Christian Doctrine was *revealed;* the other, a conclusion of natural reason. Now if the Jews had this Doctrine, they must needs have it, as *revealed;* consequently the same with the Christian. 2. That though I myself suppose the natural and the Christian Doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment to be very different things; yet I shall shew, in due time, that if Moses were indeed God's Messenger, and would teach a future state, it could be no other than the *Christian* Doctrine of it. But as those, I have to do with, may be ready to tell me, that this *due time*, like that of the *Jews' Messiah*, is either past or will never come, they will, I suppose, readily bear with me while I anticipate the subject, and in a very few words prove what is here asserted. Revelation teacheth that mankind lost the free gift of immortal life by the transgression of Adam; and, from thence became mortal, and their existence confined to this life. Revelation likewise teacheth that the MEAN which Divine Wisdom thought fit to employ in restoring man from death to his first state of immortality, was *the sacrifice of Christ on the cross.* Hence it appears to be a thing impossible, that any Messenger from God, any Agent or Instrument made use of for conducting this grand Dispensation towards its completion, could (were

* Rom. viii. 21. † For the further illustration of this matter, I would recommend to the Reader's serious perusal the first chapter of "The free and candid Examination of the Bishop of London's Principles."

it in his *choice* or in his *office* to promulgate the doctrine of a future State) speak of any other but that purchased by Christ, and promulged and proclaimed in the Gospel, since in fact, on the principles of Revelation, there is no other; and to inculcate another, would be impeaching the veracity of God, and the eternal stability of his councils.

To conclude, There is one thing which plainly evinceth that if the Jews had the knowledge or belief of a FUTURE STATE of reward and punishment, they must have had the knowledge of the REDEMPTION of man by the death and suffering of Jesus Christ, likewise. And it is this, That all the Sacrifices in the Jewish Ritual regarded only temporal things. A very competent judge in these matters assures us,—"Universa Judæorum simul congesta Sacrificia ad assequenda hujus vitæ commoda omnia facta erant."* The consequence is this, That if the Jewish religion taught its followers a future state of rewards and punishments, it either afforded them no means of attaining future happiness, or it instructed them in the doctrine of the Redemption. To say the first, contradicts the nature of all Religion; to say the latter, makes the Jewish useless, and the Christian false, as contradicting its repeated declarations, that *life and immortality*, or the doctrine of the Redemption, *was brought to light through the Gospel.*

But what was asked by St. Paul's Adversaries, will perhaps be asked by mine, *Is the* LAW *then against the* PROMISES *of God?* Or does the LAW, because it had no future state, contradict the GOSPEL, which hath? The Apostle's answer will serve me,—*God forbid: For if there had been a* LAW *which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the* LAW.† That is, if the genius of the *Law* had produced such a Dispensation as was proper to convey to mankind the free gift of life and immortality, this gift would have been conveyed by it. All this shews that the Law was not *contrary* to the Gospel, but only that it was not of sufficient excellence to be the vehicle of God's last best gift to mankind. And it shews too (and it is a very fit remark, as the result from the whole, with which to conclude this fifth *Book)* that a future state was not the Sanction of the Law of Moses, or, in the Apostle's more emphatic words, that the *Law did not* (because it could not) *give life.*

Thus, I presume, it is now proved beyond all reasonable question, THAT THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE OF REWARD AND PUNISHMENT IS NOT TO BE FOUND IN, NOR DID MAKE PART OF, THE MOSAIC DISPENSATION.

It will be asked then, "What were the real sentiments of these early Jews concerning the soul?" Though the question be a little out of time, yet as the answer is short, I shall give it here. They were doubtless the same with those of the rest of mankind, who have

* OUTRAM *De Sacr.* p. 305. † Gal. iii. 21.

thought upon the matter; that IT SURVIVED THE BODY: But having, from Moses's silence and the establishment of another Sanction, no expectation of future rewards and punishments, they simply concluded that *it returned to him who gave it.** But, as to any interesting speculations concerning its state of survivorship, 'tis plain they had none. Indeed how should they have any? when PERSONALITY did not enter into the idea of this *survivorship*, that being only annexed to the *rewards and punishments* of a future state. Hence it was that those ancient Philosophers (almost all the theistical Philosophers of Greece) who considered the soul as a SUBSTANCE distinct from the body, and not a mere QUALITY of it (for they were not such idiots as to conceive, that *thought* could result from any combinations of *matter and motion)*, those Philosophers, I say, who considered the soul as a substance, and yet disbelieved a future state of rewards and punishments, denied it all future *personality*, and held the refusion of it into the τὸ ἓν, or the soul of the world.† And just such INTERESTING SPECULATIONS concerning it had the few philosophic Jews of the most early times, as appears from the book of Ecclesiastes, which speaks their sentiments. *Who knoweth* (says this author) *the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?*‡ And again: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, AND THE SPIRIT SHALL RETURN UNTO GOD WHO GAVE IT."§ Yet this writer, perfectly conformable to what I have delivered, says, at the same time: *But the dead know not any thing, neither have they* ANY MORE A REWARD, *for the memory of them is forgotten.*‖

And where was the wonder? that a matter which so little concerned them, namely, the future condition of a portion of etherial Spirit divested of its Personality, should only float idly in the brain, when we reflect that even the knowledge of the FIRST CAUSE OF ALL THINGS, while he made no part of the *National Worship*, was entertained by the Gentiles (as appears from all Antiquity) with the utmost unconcern, neither regulating their notions, nor influencing their actions.

But from this uninteresting state, in which the Doctrine, concerning the Soul, remained amongst the early Jews, the SADDUCEES concluded that their Ancestors believed the *extinction* of the soul on death. Hence likewise came some late Revivers of this opinion, of the *extinction of the soul;* though maintained under the softer name of its SLEEP between death and the resurrection: For they go upon

* Eccles. xii. 7. † See "Divine Legation," vol. i. book iii. ‡ Eccles. iii. 21. *Vide* CLERICUM *et* DRUSIUM in loc. § Eccles. xii. 7. *Vide* CLERICUM in loc. ‖ Eccles. ix. 5.

the Sadducean principle, that the soul is a *quality* only, and not a *substance*.

In support of this opinion, the Revivers of it proceed on the sophism, which Polytheists employ to combat the unity of the Godhead. *All Philosophical arguments* (says the Reviver, after having quoted a number of wonderful things from Scripture, to prove the soul a *quality*, and mortal) *drawn from our notions of matter, and urged against the possibility of life, thought and agency, being so connected with some portions of it as to constitute a compound Being or Person, are merely grounded on our ignorance.** Just so the Polytheist. "All arguments for the Unity, from metaphysics, are manifestly vain, and merely grounded on our ignorance. You Believers" (says he) "must be confined to Scripture: Now Scripture assures us, THERE ARE GODS MANY," which, by the way, I think a stronger text, certainly a directer, against the *unity of the Godhead*, than any this learned Writer has produced for the *sleep of the Soul*. But what say Believers to this? They say, that Scripture takes the *unity*, as well as the *existence* of the Deity, for granted; takes them for truths demonstrable by natural light. Just so it is with regard to that *immaterial substance*, the Soul. Scripture supposes men to be so far informed of the nature of the Soul, by the same light, as to know that it cannot be destroyed by any of those causes which bring about the extinction of the body. Our Dreamers † are aware of this, and therefore hold with Unbelievers, that the Soul is *no substance*, but a *quality* only; and so have taken effectual care indeed, that its repose shall not be disturbed in this, which we may emphatically call, the SLEEP OF DEATH. *We can never prove* (says another of these sleepers)‡ *that the Soul of man is of such a nature that it can and must exist and live, think, act, enjoy, &c. separate from, and independent of, the body. All our present experience shews the contrary. The operations of the mind depend* CONSTANTLY and INVARIABLY *upon the state of the body, of the brain in particular. If some dying persons have a lively use of their rational faculties to the very last, it is because death has invaded some other part, and the brain remains sound and vigorous.*§ This is the long-exploded trash of *Coward, Toland, Collins*, &c. And he who can treat us with it at this time of day, has either never read CLARKE and BAXTER on the subject (in which he had been better employed than in writing upon it), or never understood them.—So far as to the abstract truth. Let us consider next the practical consequences. Convince the philosophic Libertine

* "Considerations on the Theory of Religion," p. 398, ed. 3d. † St. Jude's *filthy dreamers* only *defiled the Flesh*. These *defile the Spirit*. ‡ TAYLOR, of Norwich. § Ibid. p. 401.

that the Soul is a quality arising out of *matter*, and vanishing on the dissolution of the *form*, and then see if ever you can bring him to believe the Christian Doctrine of the RESURRECTION! While he held the Soul to be an immaterial substance, existing, as well in its separation from, as in its conjunction with, the body, and he could have no reason, arising from the Principles of true Philosophy, to stagger in his belief of this revealed doctrine.—*Thou fool that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die,** is good philosophy as well as good divinity: for if the body, instead of its earthly nature, were to have a heavenly, it must needs pass through death and corruption to qualify it for that change. But when this *body died*, what occasion was there for the *Soul*, which was to suffer no change, to *fall asleep?*

But their *sleep of the Soul* is mere cant: and this brings me to the last consideration, the sense and consistency of so ridiculous a notion. They go, as we observed, upon the Sadducean principle, that the Soul is a *quality* of body, not a *substance* of itself, and so dies with its substratum. Now *sleep*, is a modification of Existence, not of non-existence; so that though the sleep of a *Substance* hath a meaning, the sleep of a *quality* is nonsense. And if ever this Soul of theirs re-exerts its faculties, it must be by means of a REPRODUCTION, not by a mere AWAKING; and they may as well talk of the SLEEP of a mushroom turned again into the substance of the dunghill from whence it arose, and from which, not the same, but another mushroom shall, in time, arise. In a word, neither Unbelievers nor Believers will allow to these *middle men* that a new-existing Soul, which is only a quality resulting from a glorified body, can be identically the same with an annihilated Soul, which had resulted from an earthly body. But perhaps, as Hudibras had discovered the Receptacle of the *ghosts of defunct bodies*, so these gentlemen may have found out the yet subtiler corner, where the *ghosts of defunct qualities* repose.

* St. Paul. (1 Cor. xv. 36.)

APPENDIX

TO

THE FIFTH BOOK.

A LATE noble and voluminous Author,* who hath written with more than ordinary spleen against THE RELIGION OF HIS COUNTRY, as it is founded in Revelation and established by Law, hath attacked with more than ordinary fury the Author of *The Divine Legation of Moses demonstrated*, and of *The Alliance between Church and State vindicated.*

I shall shortly find a fitter place to examine his reasoning against the *Alliance.* At present let us see what he has to urge against the argument of the *Divine Legation*, which is founded on these two facts, the *omission of the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments* in the Mosaic Dispensation; and the *administration of an extraordinary Providence* in the same Dispensation.

His Lordship begins with the OMISSION, which he acknowledges: and to evade the force of the argument arising from it, casts about for a reason, independent of the EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE, to account for it.

His first solution is this,—"MOSES DID NOT BELIEVE THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, nor the rewards and punishments of another life, though it is possible he might have learnt these Doctrines from the Egyptians, WHO TAUGHT THEM VERY EARLY, perhaps as they taught that of the Unity of God. When I say, *that Moses did not believe the immortality of the soul*, nor future rewards and punishments, my reason is this, that he taught neither, when *he had to do with a people whom a Theocracy could not restrain;* and on whom, therefore, terrors of Punishment, *future* as well as present, *eternal* as well as temporary, could never be too much multiplied, or too strongly inculcated." †

This reasoning is altogether worthy of his Lordship. Here we have a DOCTRINE, confessed to be plausible in itself, and therefore of easy admittance; most alluring to human nature, and therefore embraced by all mankind; of highest account among the Egyptians, and therefore ready to be embraced by the Israelites, who were fond of Egyptian notions; of strongest efficacy on the minds of an unruly People, and therefore of indispensable use; Yet, all this notwithstanding, *Moses did not believe it, and, on that account, would not teach it.*—But then, had MOSES's integrity been so severe, How came he to write a History which, my Lord thinks, is, in part at least, a fiction of his own? Did he *believe* that? How came he to leave

* LORD BOLINGBROKE. † Vol. iii. p. 289.

the Israelites, as my Lord assures us he did, in possession of many of the superstitious opinions of Egypt? did he *believe* these too? No, but they served his purpose; which was, The better governing an unruly People. Well, but his Lordship tells us, the doctrine of a future state served this purpose best of all; for *having to do with a People whom a Theocracy could not restrain, terrors of punishment,* FUTURE *as well as present,* ETERNAL *as well as temporary, could never be too much multiplied, or too strongly inculcated.* No matter for that. MOSES, as other men may, on a sudden grows scrupulous; and so, together with the maxims of common politics, throws aside the principles of common sense; and when he had employed all the other inventions of fraud, he boggles at this, which best served his purpose; was most innocent in itself; and was most important in its general, as well as particular use.

In his Lordship's next Volume, this *Omission* comes again upon the stage; and then we have *another* reason assigned for MOSES's conduct in this matter. "MOSES would not teach the Doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and of a future state, *on account of the many superstitions* which this Doctrine had begot in Egypt, as we must believe, or *believe that he knew nothing of it,* OR ASSIGN SOME WHIMSICAL REASON FOR HIS OMISSION." *

We have seen before, that MOSES omitted a future state, *because he did not believe it.* This reason is now out of date; and one or other of the three following is to be assigned; either because it *begot superstitions;* or because *he knew nothing of it;* or if you will allow neither of these, you must have recourse, he tells you, to Warburton's WHIMSICAL REASON, that *the Jews were under an extraordinary Providence.*

Let us take him then, at his word, without expecting however, that he will stand to it; and having shewn his two first reasons not worth a rush, leave the last, established, even on his own concessions.

1. *Moses,* says he, *omitted a future state on account of the many superstitions, which this doctrine had begot in Egypt.* But if the *omission* stands upon this principle, MOSES must have omitted an infinite number of things, which, Lord Bolingbroke says, he borrowed of the Egyptians; part of which, in his Lordship's opinion, were those very superstitions, which this *Doctrine had begot;* such as the notion of TUTELARY DEITIES: and part, what arose out of that notion; in the number of which were *distinction between things clean and unclean;* an *hereditary Priesthood; sacerdotal habits;* and *Rites of sacrifice.*

2. However, he has another reason for the omission: MOSES *might know nothing of it.* To which, if I only opposed his Lordship's own words in another place, where (giving us the reasons why MOSES did *know something* of a future state) he observes, there are *certain rites, which seem to allude or have a remote relation to this very doctrine,*† it might be deemed sufficient. But I will go further, and observe, that, from the very LAWS of MOSES themselves, we have an internal evidence of his knowledge of this doctrine. Amongst the Laws against Gentile Divinations, there is one directed against that species of them, called by the Greeks, NECROMANCY,

* Vol. iv. p. 470. † Vol. v. p. 239.

or *invocation of the dead;* which necessarily implies, in the Lawgiver who forbids it, as well as in the offender who uses it, the *knowledge of a future state.*

3. This being the fate of his Lordship's two reasons, we are now abandoned by him, and left to follow our own inventions, or to take up with SOME WHIMSICAL REASON FOR THE OMISSION; that is, to allow that, as the Jews were under an *extraordinary* Providence, MOSES in quality of Lawgiver had NO OCCASION for the doctrine of a *future state.*

However, his Lordship, dissatisfied, as well he might, with the solutions hitherto proposed, returns again to the charge; and in his *Corona operis,* the book of FRAGMENTS, more openly opposes the doctrine of the *Divine Legation*; and enlarges and expatiates upon the reason before given for the *omission;* namely, *the many superstitions this doctrine had begotten in Egypt.*

"ONE CANNOT SEE WITHOUT SURPRIZE" (says his Lordship) "a doctrine so useful to ALL Religion, and therefore incorporated into ALL the Systems of Paganism, left wholly out of that of the JEWS. Many probable reasons might be brought to shew, that it was an Egyptian doctrine before the Exode, and this particularly, that it was propagated from Egypt, so soon, at least, afterwards, by all those who were instructed like MOSES, in the wisdom of that People. He transported much of his Wisdom into the scheme of Religion and Government, which he gave the Israelites; and, amongst other things, certain Rites, which may seem to allude, or have a remote relation to, this very doctrine. Though this doctrine therefore, had not been that of ABRAHAM, ISAAC, and JACOB, he might have adopted it with as little scruple, as he did many customs and institutions merely Egyptian. He had to do with a rebellious, but a superstitious people. In the first Character, they made it necessary that he should neglect nothing which might add weight to his ordinances, and contribute to keep them in awe. In the second, their disposition was extremely proper to receive such a doctrine, and to be influenced by it. *Shall we say that an hypothesis of future rewards and punishments, was* USELESS *among a People who lived under a Theocracy,* and that the future Judge of other People, was their immediate Judge and King, who resided in the midst of them, and who dealed out rewards and punishments on every occasion? Why then were so many precautions taken? Why was a solemn Covenant made with God, as with a temporal Prince? Why were so many promises and threatnings of rewards and punishments, temporal indeed, but future and contingent, as we find in the book of Deuteronomy, most pathetically held out by MOSES? Would there have been any more impropriety in holding out those of one kind than those of another, because the Supreme Being, who disposed and ordered both, was in a particular manner present amongst them? Would an addition to the catalogue of rewards and punishments more remote, but eternal, and in all respects far greater, have had no effect? I think neither of these things can be said.

"What shall we say then? How came it to pass, this addition was not made? I will mention what occurs to me, and shall not be over solicitous

about the weight that my reflections may deserve. If the doctrines of the immortality of the soul and of a future state had been revealed to MOSES, that he might teach them to the Israelites, he would have taught them most certainly. But he did not teach them. They were therefore not revealed to him. Why they were not so revealed some PERT DIVINE OR OTHER WILL BE READY TO TELL YOU. For me, I dare not presume to guess. But this, I may presume to advance, that since these Doctrines were not revealed by God to his servant MOSES, it is highly probable that this Legislator made a scruple of teaching them to the Israelites, how well soever instructed he might be in them himself, and howsoever useful to Government he might think them. The superstitious and idolatrous rites of the Egyptians, like those of other nations, were founded on the Polytheism, and the Mythology, that prevailed, and were suffered to prevail, amongst the Vulgar, and that made the sum of their Religion. It seemed to be a point of policy to direct all these absurd opinions and practices to the service of Government, instead of attempting to root them out. But then the great difference between rude and ignorant nations and such as were civilized and learned, like the Egyptians, seems to have been this, that the former had no other system of Religion than these absurd opinions and practices, whereas the latter had an *inward* as well as an *outward* Doctrine. There is reason to believe that natural Theology and natural Religion had been taught and practised in the ancient Theban Dynasty; and it is probable that they continued to be an *inward* doctrine in the rest of Egypt; while Polytheism, Idolatry, and all the MYSTERIES, all the impieties, and all the follies of Magic, were the *outward* doctrine. MOSES might be let into a knowledge of both; and under the patronage of the Princess, whose Foundling he was, he might be initiated into those *Mysteries*, where the secret doctrine alone was taught, and the outward exploded. But we cannot imagine that the Children of Israel, in general, enjoyed the same privilege, nor that the Masters were so lavish, to their Slaves, of a favour so distinguished, and often so hard to obtain. No. The Children of Israel knew nothing more than the outside of the Religion of Egypt; and if the doctrine, we speak of, was known to them, it was known only in the superstitious rites, and with all the fabulous circumstances in which it was dressed up and presented to vulgar belief. It would have been hard therefore to teach, or to renew this Doctrine in the minds of the Israelites, without giving them an occasion the more, to recal the polytheistical fables, and practise the idolatrous Rites they had learnt during their Captivity. Rites and Ceremonies are often so equivocal, that they may be applied to very different doctrines. But when they are so closely connected with one Doctrine that they are not applicable to another, to teach the Doctrine is, in some sort, to teach the Rites and Ceremonies, and to authorize the fables on which they are founded. MOSES therefore being at liberty to teach this doctrine of rewards and punishments in a future state, or not to teach it, might very well choose the latter; though he indulged the Israelites, on account of the hardness of their hearts, and by the divine permission, as it is presumed, in several observances and customs which did not lead directly,

though even they did so perhaps in consequence, to the Polytheism and Idolatry of Egypt." *

What a Babel of bad reasoning has his Lordship here accumulated out of the rubbish of false and inconsistent principles! And all, to insult the Temple of God and the Fortress of Mount Sion. Sometimes, he represents MOSES as a divine Messenger, and distinguishes between what was revealed, and what was not revealed, unto him; and then, *a future state not being revealed to* MOSES *was the reason he did not teach it.* Sometimes again, he considers him as a mere human Lawgiver, acquiring all his knowledge of Religion and Politics from the Egyptians, in whose *secret* Learning he had been intimately instructed; and then, the reason of the *omission* is, *lest the Doctrine of a future state should have drawn the Israelites into those Egyptian superstitions*, from which, it was MOSES's purpose to estrange them. All these inconsistencies in *Fact* and *Reasoning*, his Lordship delivers in the same breath, and without the least intimation of any change in his Principles or Opinions.

But let us follow him step by step, without troubling our heads about his real sentiments. It is enough, that we confute all he says, whether under his own, or any assumed Character.

He begins with confessing, that ONE CANNOT SEE WITHOUT SURPRIZE, *a doctrine so useful to* ALL *Religions, and therefore incorporated into* ALL *the Systems of Paganism, left wholly out of that of the Jews.*

At length then it appears, that this OMISSION is no light or trivial matter, which may be accounted for, as he before supposed, by MOSES's *disbelief* of the doctrine; his *ignorance* of it; or the *imaginary mischiefs* it might possibly produce. We may be allowed then to think it deserved all the pains, the Author of the *Divine Legation of Moses* has bestowed upon it: whose WHIMSICAL REASONING, if it ended in a demonstration of the truth of Revealed Religion, is sufficiently atoned for, though it were a little out of the common road: for in this case the old proverb would hold true, that *the furthest way about is the nearest way home.*

His Lordship proceeds to shew, in direct opposition to what he said before, that MOSES could not be ignorant of the doctrine of a future state, because the Egyptians taught it: His knowledge of it (my Lord tells us) further appears from an *internal* circumstance, *some of his rites seeming to allude, or to have a remote relation to, this very doctrine.* This I observe, to his Lordship's credit. The remark is just and accurate. But we are in no want of his *remote relation:* I have shewn just above, that the Jewish Laws against *Necromancy* necessarily imply Moses's knowledge of the Doctrine.

He then goes on to explain the advantages which, humanly speaking, the Israelites must have received from this Doctrine, in the temper and circumstances with which they left Egypt. MOSES, says he, *had to do with a rebellious and superstitious People.* This likewise I observe to his credit: It has the same marks of sagacity and truth; and brings us to the very verge of the *Solution*, proposed by the Author of the *Divine Legation;* which is, that the Israelites were indeed under an EXTRAORDINARY PROVI-

* Vol. v. pp. 238—241.

DENCE, which supplied all the disadvantages of the OMISSION. Under a *common and unequal* Providence, RELIGION cannot subsist without the doctrine of a future state: for Religion implying a just retribution of reward and punishment, which under such a Providence is not dispensed, a future state must needs subvene, to prevent the whole Edifice from falling into ruin. And thus we account for the *fact*, which his Lordship so amply acknowledges, viz. *that the doctrine of a future state was most useful to* ALL *Religions, and therefore incorporated into* ALL *the Religions of Paganism.* But where an EXTRAORDINARY Providence is administered, good and evil are exactly distributed; and therefore, in this circumstance, a FUTURE STATE is not necessary for the support of Religion. It is not to be found in the Mosaic Oeconomy; yet this Oeconomy subsisted for many ages; Religion therefore did not need it; or in other words, it was supported by an EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE.

This is the argument of the *Divine Legation.* And now, let us consider his Lordship's present attempt to evade it.

Shall we say, that an Hypothesis of future rewards and punishments was useless amongst a people who lived under a THEOCRACY, *and that the future Judge of other People was their immediate Judge and King, who resided in the midst of them, and who dealt out rewards and punishments on every occasion?* WHY THEN WERE SO MANY PRECAUTIONS *taken?* &c.

First, let me observe, that the PRECAUTIONS here objected to, are intended for an insinuation against the truth of Moses's Promise of an *extraordinary Providence.* A kind of SOPHISM which his Lordship advances, and only holds in common with the rest who have written against the *Divine Legation:* and which I shall here, after much forbearance on my part, expose as it deserves.

MOSES affirms again and again, that his People were under an *extraordinary Providence.* He affirms it indeed; but as it is not a self-evident truth, it needs to be proved. Till then, the Unbeliever is at liberty to urge any circumstance in the Jewish Law or History, which may seem to bring the *reality* of that Providence into question: The same liberty too has the Believer; if, at least, he can persuade himself to make use of it; as many, so professing themselves, have done both in their Writings and Discoursings against the *Divine Legation.* Things were in this train, when I undertook the defence of MOSES: And to obviate all objections to the Legislator's credit, arising from any doubtful or unfavourable circumstance in the Law or History of the Jews concerning this *extraordinary Providence*, I advanced the INTERNAL ARGUMENT of the OMISSION. An argument which necessarily inferred "that an extraordinary Providence was in fact administered in the Jewish Republic." What change did this make in the state of the case? A very great one. Unbelievers were now indeed at liberty, and Believers too, if so perversely inclined, to oppose, and, as they could, to confute the Argument of the *Divine Legation:* But by no rules of good Logic could they come over again with those scripture difficulties to Moses's credit, which the argument of the *Divine Legation* had entirely obviated, and which it still continued to exclude, so long as it

remained unanswered. For while a demonstrated truth stands good, no difficulties arising from it, however inexplicable, can have any weight against that superior evidence. Not to admit this fundamental maxim of common sense, would be to unsettle many a physical and mathematical demonstration, as well as this *moral* one.

I say therefore, as things now stand, To oppose difficulties against the administration of an extraordinary Providence, after that Providence has been proved, and before the proof has been confuted, is the most palpable and barefaced imposition on our understanding. In which however, his Lordship is but one of a hundred: and truly, in this, the least indecent and inconsistent of the hundred; as his declared purpose is to destroy the credit and authority of the Jewish Lawgiver.

I shall not however decline to examine the weight of these objections, though they be so vainly and sophistically obtruded.

If there was this EXTRAORDINARY Providence administered, says his Lordship, *Why so many Precautions taken? Why was a solemn covenant made with God as with a temporal Prince? Why were so many promises and threatnings of rewards and punishments, temporal indeed, but future and contingent, as we find in the Book of Deuteronomy, most pathetically held out by Moses?* This difficulty is not hard to be resolved. We find throughout that Book which we Believers are wont to call the *History of Providence*, but which his Lordship is pleased to intitle, *Tales more extravagant than those of Amadis de Gaule*, that God, in his moral Government of the World, always employs human means, as far as those means will go; and never interposes with his *extraordinary Providence*, but when they will go no further. To do otherwise, would be an unnecessary waste of Miracles; better fitted to confound our knowledge of NATURE, by obscuring the harmony of order, in such a control of its delegated Powers, than to make manifest the presence of its sovereign Lord and Master. This method in God's moral Government, all our ideas of Wisdom seem to support. Now when He, the great Director of the Universe, had decreed to rule the Jewish People in an extraordinary way, he did not propose to supersede any of the measures of civil regimen. And this, I hope, will be esteemed a sufficient answer to—WHY SO MANY PRECAUTIONS TAKEN, &c. But the Reader will find this argument drawn out more at large, in my remarks on the same kind of sophistry employed by Dr. SYKES.

But (says his Lordship) *would the hypothesis of a future state have been useless*, &c.? *Would there* (as his Lordship goes on) *have been any more impropriety in holding out those* [sanctions] *of one kind than those of another, because the supreme Being, who disposed and ordered both, was in a particular manner present amongst them? Would an addition of rewards and punishments (more remote, but eternal, and in all respects far greater) to the catalogue, have had no effect? I think neither of these things can be said.* His Lordship totally mistakes the drift of the Argument of the *Divine Legation*, which infers no more, from the fact of the *omission*, than this, That the Jewish Oeconomy, administered by an *extraordinary* Providence,

could do without the service of the *omitted* Doctrine; not, that that Doctrine, even under such a Dispensation, was *of no use*, much less that it was IMPROPER. But then one of his Followers will be ready to say, "If a *future state* was not *improper*, much more if it was of *use*, under an extraordinary dispensation, How came MOSES not to give it?" I reply, for great and wise ends of Providence vastly countervailing the use of that Doctrine, which, in the last volume of this work, will be explained at large.

Lord Bolingbroke proceeds next to tell us, what occurs to Him, concerning the REASONS of the *omission;* and previously assures us, he is *not over solicitous about their weight.* This, I suppose, is to make his *Counters* pass current: For then they become the *money of fools*, as Hobbes expresses it, when we cease to be *solicitous* about their worth; when we try them by their colour, not their weight; their Rhetoric, and not their Logic. However this must be said with an exception to the first, which is altogether logical, and very diverting.

If (says his Lordship) *the doctrine of the immortality of the soul and a future state had been revealed to Moses, that he might teach them to the Israelites, he would have taught them most certainly. But he did not teach them. They were, therefore, not revealed.* It is in mood and figure, you see; and, I warrant you, designed to supply what was wanting in the *Divine Legation:* Though, as the Author of that book certainly believed these *doctrines were not revealed*, 'tis ten to one but he thought Moses was not at liberty to teach them: Unless you can suppose that his Lordship, who believed nothing of Revelation, might believe Moses to be restrained from teaching what God had not revealed to him; and yet, that the Author of the *Divine Legation*, who held Moses's pretensions to be true, might think him at liberty to go beyond his Commission. Thus far, then, we may be said to agree: But this good understanding does not last long. His Lordship's *modesty* and my *pertness* soon make the breach as wide as ever.—*Why they were not so revealed* (says his Lordship) *some* PERT DIVINE *or other will be ready to tell you. For me, I dare not pretend to guess.* My forwardness, and his Lordship's backwardness, are equally well suited to our respective principles. Should his Lordship have guessed, it might have brought him to what he most dreaded, the divine original of the Jewish Religion: Had I forborn to guess, I had betrayed my cause, and left those DATA unemployed, which enabled me, I do not say to guess, but to discover, and to *demonstrate the Divine Legation of Moses.*

However, *This*, his Lordship *will presume to advance, that since these doctrines were not revealed by God to his servant* MOSES, *it is highly probable, that the Legislator made a scruple of teaching them to the Israelites, howsoever well instructed he might be in them himself, and howsoever useful to Government he might think them.*

Here, you see, he personates a Believer, who holds MOSES to be an inspired Lawgiver: But observe how poorly he sustains his part! Either MOSES did indeed receive the LAW from God, or he did not. If he did not, Why are we mocked with the distinction between what was revealed,

and what was not revealed, when nothing was revealed? If MOSES did receive the *Law* from God, Why are we still worse mocked with the distinction between what was revealed, and what was not revealed, when every thing regarding the Dispensation must needs be revealed; as well, the direction to omit a *Future State*, as the direction to *inculcate the Unity of the Godhead?* Why was all this mockery? the Reader asks. For a very good purpose: it was to draw us from the TRUE object of our inquiry, which is, What GOD intended by the *omission;* to that FANTASTIC object, which only respects what MOSES intended by it. For the intention of GOD supposes the mission and inspiration of a Prophet; but the intention of MOSES, when considered in contradistinction to the intention of God, terminates in the human views of a mere politic Lawgiver; which leads us back again to Infidelity.

But he soon strips Moses of his Mission, and leaves him to cool, in Querpo, under his civil character as before. And here he considers, What it was, which, under this character, might induce Moses to *omit* a future state; and he finds it to be, lest this doctrine should have hurt the doctrine of the UNITY, which it was his purpose to inculcate amongst his People, in opposition to the Egyptian Polytheism.

Moses (says his Lordship), *it is highly probable, made a scruple of teaching these Doctrines to the Israelites, howsoever well instructed he might be in them himself, and howsoever useful to Government he might think them. The People of Egypt, like all other nations, were Polytheists, but different from all others: there was in Egypt an inward as well as outward Doctrine: Natural Theology and natural Religion were the* INWARD *Doctrine; while Polytheism, Idolatry, and* ALL THE MYSTERIES, *all the impieties and follies of magic, were the* OUTWARD *Doctrine. Moses was initiated into those Mysteries where the secret doctrine alone was taught, and the outward exploded.* —For an accurate as well as just Divider commend me to his Lordship. In distinguishing between the *inward* and *outward* doctrines of the Egyptians, he puts *all the mysteries* amongst the *outward:* though if they had an *inward*, it must necessarily be part of those *Mysteries*. But he makes amends presently (but his amends to truth is, as it should be, always at the expence of a contradiction), and directly says, that MOSES LEARNT THE INWARD DOCTRINE IN THE MYSTERIES. Let this pass: He proceeds— *Moses had the knowledge of both outward and inward. Not so the Israelites in general. They knew nothing more than the outside of the Religion of Egypt. And if a future state was known to them, it was known only in the superstitious rites, and with all the fabulous circumstances, in which it was dressed up and presented to the vulgar belief. It would be hard therefore to teach or to renew this doctrine in the minds of the Israelites, without giving them an occasion the more to recal the Polytheistical fables, and practise the idolatrous rites they had learnt during the Captivity.*

The Children of Israel, it seems, *knew no more of a future state, than by the superstitious rites and fabulous circumstances with which it was dressed up and presented to the public belief.* What then? MOSES, he owns, *knew more.* And what hindered MOSES from communicating of his knowledge

to the People, when he took them under his protection, and gave them a new Law and a new Religion? His Lordship gives us to understand that this People knew as little of the UNITY; for he tells us, it was amongst the *inward* Doctrines of the Egyptians: yet this did not hinder Moses from instructing his people in the doctrine of the Unity. What then should hinder his teaching them the *inward* doctrine of a future state, divested of its fabulous circumstances? He had divested *Religious worship* of the absurdities of Demi-Gods and Heroes; What should hinder him from divesting a *future state* of Charon's boat and the Elysian fields? But the notion of a future state would have recalled those fabulous circumstances which had been long connected with it. And was not Religious worship, under the idea of a *tutelar Deity*, and a *temporal King*, much more apt to recal the polytheism of Egypt? Yet Moses ventured upon this inconvenience, for the sake of great advantages: Why should he not venture on the other, for the sake of greater? for the doctrine of a future state is, as his Lordship confesses, even necessary both to civil and religious Society. But what does he talk of the danger of giving entry to the fables and superstitions concerning the Soul (superstitions, which, though learnt indeed in the Captivity, were common to all the nations under Polytheism) when in other places he assures us, that Moses indulged the Israelites in the most characteristic superstitions of Egypt?

However, let us see how he supports this profound observation. *Rites and Ceremonies* (says his Lordship) *are often so equivocal, that they may be applied to very different doctrines. But when they are so closely connected with a doctrine, that they are not applicable to another, to teach the doctrine is,* IN SOME SORT, *to teach the rites and ceremonies.—In some sort*, is well put in, to soften the deformity of this inverted logic. His point is to shew that a superstitious Rite, relating to, and dependent on, a certain doctrine, will obtrude itself whenever that Doctrine is taught: and his reasoning is only calculated to prove, that where the Rite is practised, the Doctrine will soon follow. This may indeed be true. But then it does not hold in the converse, that the Rite follows the Doctrine: because a Principal may stand without its Dependent: but a Dependent can never subsist without its Principal.

Under cover of these grotesque shapes, into which his Lordship has travestied the Jewish Lawgiver, he concludes, that MOSES *being* AT LIBERTY *to teach this doctrine of rewards and punishments in a future state, or not to teach it, he might very well chuse the latter.*—Yet it was but at the very beginning of this paragraph that he tells us, *Moses was* NOT AT LIBERTY *to teach or not to teach.* His words are these, *Since this doctrine was not revealed by God to his servant Moses, it is highly probable that this Legislator* MADE A SCRUPLE *of teaching it.* But his Lordship very well knows that Statesmen soon get the better of their *scruples;* and then, by another fetch of political casuistry, find themselves more at liberty than ever.

I had observed above that our noble Discourser, who makes MOSES so *scrupulous* that he would, on no terms, afford a handle for one single superstition of Egypt to get footing among his people, has, on other occasions,

charged him with introducing them in the lump. He was sensible that his Inconsistency was likely to be detected, and therefore he now attempts to obviate it.—*Though he* [Moses] *indulged the Israelites, on account of the hardness of their hearts, and by the divine permission, as it is presumed, in several observations and customs, which did not* LEAD *directly, though even they did so perhaps* IN CONSEQUENCE, *to the Polytheism and Idolatry of Egypt.* And could the teaching the doctrine of a future state possibly do more than LEAD IN CONSEQUENCE (as his Lordship elegantly expresses it) *to the Polytheism and Idolatry of Egypt*, by drawing after it those *superstitious Rites and fabulous circumstances*, which, he tells us, then attended the popular notion of such a State? If, for the *hardness of their hearts*, they were indulged in *several observances and customs*, which only *led in consequence* to Polytheism and Idolatry, Why, for the *same* hardness of heart, were they not indulged with the doctrine of a future state, which did not lead, but by a very remote consequence, to Polytheism and Idolatry? Especially since this *hardness of heart* would less bear denying them a DOCTRINE so alluring to the human mind, than denying them a RITE, to which habit only and old custom had given an occasional propensity. Again, those Rites indulged to the People, for the *hardness of their hearts*, had, in themselves, little use or tendency to advance the ends of the Jewish Dispensation; but rather retarded them: Whereas a future state, by his Lordship's own confession, is *most useful to all Religions, and therefore incorporated into all the Systems of Paganism;* and was particularly useful to the Israelites, who were, he says, both a *rebellious* and a *superstitious* People; dispositions, which not only made it necessary to omit nothing that might inforce obedience, but likewise facilitated the reception and supported the influence of the doctrine in question.

The Reader has here the whole of his Lordship's boasted Solution of this important Circumstance of the OMISSION, in the Mosaic Law. And he sees how vainly this Resolver of doubts labours to elude its force. Overwhelmed, as it were, with the weight of so irresistible a Power, after long wriggling to get free, he at length crawls forth; but so maimed and broken, so impotent and fretful, that all his remaining strength is in his venom. And this he now sheds in abundance over the whole Mosaic Oeconomy. It is pronounced to be a gross imposture; and this very circumstance of the OMISSION is given as an undoubted proof of the accusation.

"Can we be surprised then" (says his Lordship) "that the Jews ascribed to the all-perfect Being, on various occasions, such a conduct and such Laws as are inconsistent with his most obvious perfections? Can we believe such a conduct and such Laws to have been his, on the word of the proudest and most lying Nation in the world? Many other considerations might have their place here. But I shall confine myself to one; *which I do not remember to have seen nor heard urged on one side, nor* ANTICIPATED *on the other.* To shew then, the more evidently, how ABSURD, as well as IMPIOUS it is to ascribe these Mosaical Laws to God, let it be considered, that NEITHER the people of Israel, nor their Legislator perhaps, KNEW ANY THING OF ANOTHER LIFE, wherein the crimes committed in this life are to

be punished. Although he might have learned this Doctrine, which was not so much a secret doctrine, as it may be presumed that the Unity of the supreme God was, amongst the Egyptians. Whether he had learned both or either, or neither of them in those schools, cannot be determined: BUT THIS MAY BE ADVANCED WITH ASSURANCE; If MOSES knew, that crimes, and therefore Idolatry, one of the greatest, were to be punished in another life, he deceived the people in the Covenant they made, by his intervention, with God. If he did not know it, I say it with horror, the consequence, *according to the hypothesis I oppose*, must be, that God deceived both him and them. In either case, a covenant or bargain was made, wherein the conditions of obedience and disobedience were not fully, nor by consequence, fairly stated. The Israelites had better things to hope, and worse to fear, than those which were expressed in it: and their whole history seems to shew how much need they had of these additional motives to restrain them from Polytheism and Idolatry, and to answer the assumed Purposes of divine Providence."*

This argument, *advanced with* so much *assurance*, his Lordship says, he does *not remember to have seen, or heard urged on one side, or anticipated on the other*. A gentle reproof, as we are to understand it, of the Author of the *Divine Legation:* for none but He, I think, could *anticipate* an objection to an ARGUMENT which none but He had employed. However, though it be now too late to *anticipate*, we have still time enough to answer.

Let it be considered (says his Lordship) *that perhaps Moses* KNEW NOTHING *of another life, wherein the crimes committed in this life are to be punished.—Considered* by whom? Not by his Lordship, or his kind Readers: for his former reasoning, which I will here again repeat, had brought them to *consider* otherwise. These are his words: "Many probable reasons might be brought to shew, that this was an Egyptian doctrine before the Exode; and this particularly, that it was propagated from Egypt, so soon at least afterwards, by all those who were instructed LIKE MOSES, in the wisdom of that people. He transported much of this wisdom into the scheme of Religion and Government which he gave the Israelites; and, among other things, certain Rites, which SEEM TO ALLUDE, OR HAVE A REMOTE RELATION, TO THIS DOCTRINE."† This possibly might have recurred to his Lordship, while he was boasting of his new and *unanticipated* objection; and therefore, in the tricking it up amongst his FRAGMENTS, to his *perhaps*, he adds, by a very happy corrective, *although Moses might have learnt this Doctrine, which* WAS NOT SO MUCH A SECRET *doctrine, as it may be presumed that the Unity of the supreme God was amongst the Egyptians.* But he had done better to leave his contradictions uncorrected, and trust to the rare sagacity of his Readers to find them out. He had ever an ill hand at reconciling matters; so in the case before us, in the very act of covering one contradiction, he commits another. He is here speaking of a future state, divested of its fabulous circumstances; *Perhaps*, says he, MOSES KNEW NOTHING OF ANOTHER LIFE—*Which was* NOT SO MUCH A SECRET *doctrine as that of the Unity.* Now, Reader, turn back a moment, to

* Vol. v. pp. 194, 195. † Vol. v. pp. 328, 329.

the long quotation from his 239th page, and there thou wilt find, that a future state, divested of its fabulous circumstances, WAS AS MUCH A SECRET *Doctrine, as that of the Unity.*—"There is reason to believe, that natural Theology and natural Religion were INWARD doctrines amongst the Egyptians. MOSES might be let into a knowledge of BOTH by being initiated into those *Mysteries* where the *secret* doctrine alone was taught. But we cannot imagine, that the Children of Israel in general enjoyed the same privilege. No, *they knew nothing more than the outside* of the Egyptian Religion: and if the *Doctrine we speak of* [A FUTURE STATE] was known to them, it was known only in the superstitious Rites, and with all the fabulous circumstances, in which it was dressed up and presented to vulgar belief."—Is not this, now, a plain declaration, that a *future state*, divested of its fabulous circumstances, *was as much a secret Doctrine as the doctrine of the Unity?*

But his Lordship's contradictions are the least of my concern. It is his present Argument I have now to do with. And this, he says, he *advances* WITH ASSURANCE. It is fit he should. *Modesty* would be very ill bestowed on such opinions.

He thinks he can reduce those who hold no future state in the Jewish Oeconomy, to the necessity of owning, that MOSES, *or that* GOD *himself, acted unfairly by the Israelites.* How so, You ask? Because One or Other of them concealed that *state.* And what if they did? Why then they concealed one of the actual Sanctions of moral conduct, *future punishment.* But who told him, that this, which, he confesses, was no sanction of the *Jewish Law*, was yet a Sanction in the moral conduct of the *Jewish People?* Who, unless the ARTIFICIAL THEOLOGER? the man he most despises and decries.

And, even in *artificial Theology*, there is nothing but the CALVINISTICAL tenet of *Original Sin*, which gives the least countenance to so monstrous an opinion; every thing in the GOSPEL, every thing in NATURAL THEOLOGY, exclaims against it.

JESUS, indeed, to prove that the departed Israelites still existed, quotes the title God was pleased to give himself, of *the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob;* and this, together with their *existence*, proves likewise the *happiness* of their condition: for the relation they are said to stand in with God, shews them to be of his Kingdom. But we must remember, that the question with his Lordship is, not of *reward*, but *punishment.* Again, JESUS speaks (indeed in a parable) of the deceased *rich man*, as *in a place of torment.* But we must remember that the scene was laid at a time when the Doctrine of a *future state* was become national. To know our heavenly master's sentiments on the question of *subjection to an unknown Sanction*, we should do well to consider his words, "The servant which knew his Lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes."* Now the will of a Master or Sovereign, declared in his Laws, never includes in

* Luke xii. 47, 48.

it more than the *Sanctions* of those Laws. The Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* expressly distinguishes the sanction of the Jewish law from that of the Gospel; and makes the difference to consist in this, that the one was of *temporal* punishments, and the other of *future*. *He that despised Moses's Law* DIED *without mercy under two or three witnesses. Of how* MUCH SORER PUNISHMENT, *suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the son of God?** Which appeal is without common sense or honesty, on a supposition that the Apostle held the Jews to be subject to *future* punishments, before that Sanction was promulged amongst them. From the GOSPEL therefore it cannot be inferred, that the Israelites, while only following the Law of Moses, in which the sanction of a *future state* is not found, were liable or subject to the punishments of that state.

Let us see next, Whether NATURAL THEOLOGY, or *natural Religion* (as his Lordship is pleased, for some reason or other, to distinguish the terms), hath taught us, that a people, living under an *extraordinary Providence* or the immediate government of God, to whom he had given a Law and revealed a Religion, both supported by *temporal* sanctions only, could be deemed subject to those *future* punishments, unknown to them, which *natural* Religion before, and *revealed* Religion since, have discovered to be due to bad men living under a *common Providence*.

NATURAL RELIGION standeth on this Principle, "That the Governor of the Universe REWARDS and PUNISHES moral Agents." The length or shortness of human existence comes not primarily into the idea of Religion; not even into that compleat idea of Religion delivered by St. Paul, in his general definition of it. The Religionist, says he, *must believe that God is, and that he* IS A REWARDER *of those who seek him.*

While God exactly distributed his rewards and punishments *here*, the light of reason directed men to look no further for the Sanctions of his Laws. But when it came to be seen, that He was *not always* a Rewarder and a Punisher *here*, men necessarily concluded, from his moral attributes, that he would be so *hereafter:* and consequently, that this life was but a small portion of the human duration. Men had not yet speculated on the permanent nature of the Soul: And when they did so, that consideration, which, under an *ordinary* Providence, came strongly in aid of the *moral argument* for another life, had no tendency, under the *extraordinary*, to open to them the prospects of *futurity:* because, though they saw the Soul unaffected by those causes which brought the body to destruction, yet they held it to be equally dependent on the Will of the Creator: Who, amongst the various means of its dissolution (of which they had no idea), had, for aught they knew, provided one, or more than one, for that purpose.

In this manner was a FUTURE STATE brought, by natural light, into Religion: and from thenceforth became a necessary part of it. But under the Jewish THEOCRACY, God was an exact Rewarder and Punisher, *here*. Natural light therefore evinced that under such an administration, the subjects of it did not become liable to *future* Punishments till this sanction was known amongst them.

* Heb. x. 28, 29.

Thus NATURAL and REVEALED RELIGION shew, that his Lordship calumniated both, when he affirmed, that, *according to the hypothesis he opposed,* MOSES DECEIVED *the people in the Covenant they made, by his intervention, with God: Or that, if Moses did not know the doctrine of a future state, then* GOD DECEIVED *both him and them.*

Should it be asked, how God will deal with wicked men thus dying under the Mosaic Dispensation? I will answer, in the words of Dr. SAM. CLARKE, on a like occasion. He had demonstrated a self-moving Substance to be immaterial, and so, not perishable like Bodies. But as this demonstration included the Souls of irrational animals, it was asked, "How these were to be disposed of, when they had left their respective habitations?" To which he very properly replies, "Certainly, the omnipotent and infinitely wise God may, without any great difficulty, be supposed to have more ways of disposing of his Creatures" [I add, with perfect justice and equity, and with equal measure, to all his creatures as well accountable as unaccountable] "than we are, at present, let into the secret of."*—But if the Author of the *Divine Legation* has not promised more than he can perform (as his long delay gives his well-wishers cause to suspect and his ill-wishers to hope) this matter will be explained at large, in his account of the SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF THE REDEMPTION, which, he has told us, is to have a place in his last Volume.

Nothing now remains of this objection but what relates to the sanction of *future rewards:* And I would by no means deprive the faithful Israelites of these. His Lordship therefore has this to make his best of: and, in his opinion, the bestowing even of a *reward,* to which one has no title, is foul dealing; for he joins it with *punishment,* as if his consequence, against God's justice and goodness, might be equally deduced from either of them. —*A covenant,* says he, *was made, wherein the conditions of obedience and disobedience were not* FULLY, *nor, by consequence,* FAIRLY *stated. The Israelites had* BETTER THINGS TO HOPE, *and worse to fear, than those which were expressed in it.* Though it be hard on a generous *Benefactor* to be denied the right of giving more than he had promised; it is still harder on the poor *Dependant,* that he is not at liberty to receive more. True it is, that, in this case, the conditions are not FULLY stated; and therefore, according to his Lordship's Logic, BY CONSEQUENCE NOT FAIRLY. To strengthen this Consequence, his Lordship concludes in these words—*And their whole History seems to show how much need they had of these additional motives* [future Rewards and Punishments] *to restrain them from Polytheism and Idolatry, and to answer the* ASSUMED *purposes of Divine Providence.*

Whoever puts all these things together—"That Moses was himself of the race of Israel—was learned in all the wisdom of Egypt—and capable of freeing his People from their Yoke—that he brought them within sight of the promised Land; a fertile Country, which they were to conquer and inhabit—that he instituted a system of Laws, which has been the admiration of the wisest men of all ages—that he understood the doctrine of a FUTURE STATE; and, by his knowledge gained in Egypt, was not ignorant

* Octavo "Tracts against Dodwell and Collins," p. 103.

of the efficacy of it in general; and by his full experience of the rebellious and superstitious temper of his own People, could not but see how useful it would have been to them in particular."—Whoever, I say, puts all these things together (and all these things are amongst his Lordship's CONCESSIONS) and at the same time considers, that MOSES, throughout his whole system of Law and Religion, is entirely silent concerning a future state of Rewards and Punishments, will, I believe, conclude, that there was something more in the OMISSION than Lord BOLINGBROKE could fathom, or, at least, was willing to discover.

But let us turn from MOSES's conduct, (which will be elsewhere considered at large) to his Lordship's, which is our present business.

1. First, he gives us his conjectures, to account for the *Omission*, exclusive of MOSES's *Divine Legation:* but, as if dissatisfied with them himself (which he well might be, for they destroy one another),

2. He next attempts, you see, to prove, that the *Legation* could not be *divine*, from this very circumstance of the *omission*.

3. But now he will go further, and demonstrate that an EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE, such a one as is represented by Moses, and which, the Author of the *Divine Legation* has proved, from the circumstance of the OMISSION, was actually administered in the Jewish Republic, could not possibly be administered, without destroying *free will;* without *making Virtue servile;* and without *relaxing universal benevolence.*

4. And lastly, to make all sure, he shuts up the account by shewing, that an *extraordinary* Providence could answer no reasonable end or purpose.

In his first and last order of evasions, he seems to be alone; but in the second and third, he had the pleasure of seeing many an orthodox Writer against the Divine Legation in CONFEDERACY with him, to use his Lordship's language, when he speaks of the good understanding between DIVINES and ATHEISTS.

I have examined his first and second order. The third and fourth remain to be considered; it is the last refuge of his infidelity.

1. His principal objection to the administration of an extraordinary Providence, such as MOSES promised to his people, on the part of GOD, is, that it would DESTROY FREE-WILL. But here let me observe, that he affects to disguise the immediate Object of his attack; and, in arguing against an *extraordinary Providence*, chuses to consider it in the general, as the point rises out of an imaginary dispute between Himself and the Divines; who, he pretends, are dissatisfied with the present order of things, and require, as the terms of their acquiescence in God's government, the administration of an *equal Providence, here.* But, this obliquity in disguising the true object of his attack, not being of itself sufficient to embarras the question, he further supports it by a prevarication: for it is not true, that Divines are dissatisfied with the present order of things, or that they require a better. All the ground they ever gave his Lordship for imputing this scandal to them, being only their assertion, "That if the present state be the whole of Man's existence, then the justice of God would have more

exactly dispensed good and evil *here:* but, as he has not done so, it follows that there will be a state of Rewards and Punishments *hereafter.*"

This premised, I proceed to his first objection,—"In good earnest" (says his Lordship) "is a system of particular providences, in which the supreme Being, or his Angels, like his Ministers to reward, and his Executioners to punish, are constantly employed in the affairs of mankind, much more reasonable?" [than the *Gods* of EPICURUS or the *morals* of POLEMO]. "Would the JUSTICE of God be more MANIFEST in such a state of things than in the present? I see no room for MERIT on the part of Man, nor for JUSTICE on the part of God, in such a state." *

His Lordship asks, *whether the Justice of God would be more manifest* in such a state of things, where good is constantly dispensed to the virtuous, and evil to the wicked, *than in the present*, where good and evil happen indifferently to all men? If his Lordship, by *the present state of things*, includes the rectification of them in a future state, I answer, that the *justice of God would not be more manifest*, but equally and fully manifest in either case. If his Lordship does not include this rectification in a future state, then I answer his question by another: Would the justice of the Civil Magistrate be more manifest, where he exactly dispenses rewards to good men, and punishment to evil, than where he suffers the Cunning and the Powerful to carve for themselves?

But *he sees no room for merit on the part of Man, nor Justice on the part of God.* If he does not see, it is his own fault. It is owing to his prevaricating both with himself and his Reader; to the turning his view from the Scripture-representation of an equal Providence, to the iniquities of Calvinistical *election*, and to the partialities of Fanatics concerning the favoured workings of the Spirit; and to his giving these to the reader, in its stead. How dextrously does he slide *Enthusiasm* and *Predestination* into the Scripture doctrine of an equal Providence!—*If some men were* DETERMINED TO GOODNESS *by the secret workings of the Spirit*, &c. Yes indeed, if you will be so kind to allow him, that under an equal Providence, the Will is over-ruled, he will be able to shew you, there is an end of all merit and demerit. But this substituting ARTIFICIAL THEOLOGY (as he calls it when he is in an humour to abuse it) in the place of bible-theology, is his usual leger-de-main. So again,—*I can conceive still less, that individual Creatures before they have done either good or evil, nay, before their actual existence, can be the objects of predilection or aversion, of love or hatred to God.* Who, of the Gospel-Divines, against whom he is here writing, would have him *conceive* any thing of this at all? It is the ARTIFICIAL THEOLOGER, the depraver, as he says, of the Gospel, who would draw him into so absurd a system. But what has this exploded *Theology*, that abounds only in human inventions, to do with the extraordinary Providence, represented in holy Writ! To say, that this Providence takes away man's merit and God's justice, is confounding all our ideas of right and wrong. Is it not the highest merit of a rational creature to comply with that motive which has most real weight? And is not God's justice then most manifest when

* Vol. v. pp. 425, 426.

the order of things present fewest difficulties and obscurities in our contemplation of it? His Lordship was plainly in these sentiments, when, arguing against God's compliance with the Jewish *hardness of heart*, he thought it more becoming the Master of the Universe, to bend the perverse stiffness of their Wills: and, when, arguing against a *future state* from the present good order of things, he will shew, he says, AGAINST DIVINES AND ATHEISTS IN CONJUNCTION, that there is little or no irregularity in the present dispensations of Providence; at least, not so much as the World commonly imagine. And why was this paradox advanced, but from a consciousness that the more exact the present administration of God's providence appeared, the more manifest it made his Justice? But now his Lordship's followers may be apt to say, that their Master has here done no more, indeed scarce so much, at least not in so express terms, as a celebrated Prelate, in one of his *discourses* at the *Temple;* who tells us, "That an immediate and visible interposition of Providence in Behalf of the righteous, and for the punishment of the wicked, would INTERFERE WITH THE FREEDOM OF MORAL AGENTS, AND NOT LEAVE ROOM FOR THEIR TRYAL." * But they who object this to us have not considered the nature of moral differences. For, as another learned Prelate well observes, *A little experience may convince us, that the same thing, at different times, is not the same.*† Now if *different times* may make such alterations in identity, what must *different men* do? The *thing said* being by all candid interpretation to be regulated on the *purpose of saying*.

2. Lord Bolingbroke's second objection against an equal Providence is, that it would MAKE VIRTUE, SERVILE—"If the Good, besides the enjoyment of all that happiness which is inseparable from Virtue, were exempted from all kinds of evil, and if the Wicked, besides all those evils which are inseparable from Vice, and those which happen to all men in the ordinary course of events, were exposed to others that the hand of God inflicted on them in an extraordinary manner, such good men would have VERY LITTLE MERIT; they would have, while they continued to be good, no other merit than that of children, who are cajoled into their duty; or than that of Galley-slaves, who ply at the oar, because they hear and see and fear the lash of the boatswain." ‡

If the perfection of a rational Creature consist in acting according to reason; and if his merit rises in proportion as he advances in perfection; How can that state, which best secures him from acting irrationally, lessen or take away his merit? Are the actions of the Deity of less worth for his moral incapacity of being unjust or malignant? The motive which induces to right action is indeed more or less *excellent* according to the dignity or nature of the Agent: But the question here is not concerning the *excellence*, but the *power* of the motive to turn ACTION into PASSION; which is the only way I can conceive of destroying *merit* in the subject. Now I hold, that this fancy, That motives exterior to the Being on which they work, are able to turn an Agent to a Patient, is one of the greatest of

* Vol. ii. pp. 258, 259. † "Scripture vindicated from the Misrepresentations of the Bishop of Bangor," p. 165. ‡ Vol. v. p. 428.

Physical absurdities; and therefore commonly goes about disguised, in the garb of *Metaphysics*. For while AGENCY remains, MERIT subsists: the degrees of which do not depend on the less or greater force which the motives have on the affections, but on the more or less reason of the choice. In a word, there is no other way of taking away the merit and demerit of human actions, than by taking away agency, and making MAN passive, or, in other terms, A MACHINE.

But to expose in a more popular way the futility of this reasoning, it will be sufficient to observe, that the objection holds equally against all religious Sanctions whatsoever. And so indeed it was fairly urged by Lord Shaftesbury: who pretended that every motive regarding SELF, tended to servilize Virtue. Without doubt, one sort, just as much as another; a *future state*, just as well as an *equal Providence*. Nay, if we were to appreciate matters very nicely, it would seem, that *a future state without an equal providence* (for they are always to be considered separately, as they belong to different Dispensations) would more strongly incline the Will, than *an equal providence without a future state:* as the value of *future* above *present* good is, in this case, immensely great. But the human mind being so constituted, that the *distance* of *good* takes off proportionably from its influence, this brings the force of the two sanctions nearer to an equality; which at length proves but this, That the objection to the *merit of Virtue* holds against all religious sanctions whatsoever. In the use of which objection, Lord Shaftesbury was not only more ingenuous, as he urged it against them *all*, but more consistent, as he urged it on his doctrine of a perfect *disinterestedness* in our nature; whereas Lord Bolingbroke is amongst those who hold, that *self-love* and *social*, though coincident, are two essential principles in the human frame.

> "That two consistent motions act the Soul,
> And one regards ITSELF, and one the WHOLE."

But we might go further, and retort upon both these noble Adversaries of Religion, that the charge of *making virtue servile* affects all *moral*, as well as *religious* sanctions; as well that, whose existence they allow, as those which they would persuade us to be visionary; both these illustrious Patrons of infidelity acknowledging that moral sanction which arises from *God's making the practice of virtue our* INTEREST *as well as duty*.* Now *interest* and *servility* is, it seems, the same thing, with these generous Spirits, as it was with the good old woman, Joinville speaks of, amongst the Enthusiasts of Syria, who carried about a pan of live-coals in one hand, and a dish of cold water in the other, to burn up Paradise and to extinguish Hell, that men might be brought to serve God dispassionately, without hope or fear.—So near a-kin are Fanaticism and Free-thinking, that their nature betrays them even when they strive most to hide their common parentage.

3. His Lordship's third cavil to an equal Providence is, that it would RELAX GENERAL BENEVOLENCE.

—"But would there not be, at the same time, some further defect in this scheme? I think there would. It seems to me, that these good men being

* Vol. v. p. 429. † Ibid.

thus distinguished by particular providences, in their favour, from the rest of mankind, might be apt either not to contract, or to LOSE THAT GENERAL BENEVOLENCE, which is a fundamental Principle of the Law of Nature, and that PUBLIC SPIRIT, which is the life and soul of Society. God has made the practice of morality our interest, as well as our duty. But men who found themselves constantly protected from the evils that fell on others, might grow insensibly to think themselves unconcerned in the common fate: and if they relaxed in their zeal for the Public good, they would relax in their virtue; for public good is the object of Virtue. They might do worse; spiritual pride might infect them. They might become in their own imaginations the little Flock, or the chosen Sheep. Others have been so by the mere force of Enthusiasm, without any such inducements as those which we assume, in the same case; and experience has shewn, that there are no Wolves like these Sheep." *

The *case assumed*, to which his Lordship objects, and against which he pretends to argue, is that of an *equal Providence which exactly distributes good to Virtue, and to Vice evil.* Now the present objection to such a state is, an' please you, that this *favourable distinction* of good, to the virtuous man, would be apt *to destroy his general benevolence and public spirit.* These, in his Lordship's account, and so in mine too, are the most sublime of all Virtue; and therefore, it is agreed, they will be most highly rewarded: But the tendency of this *favourable distinction*, if you will believe him, may prove *the loss of general benevolence and public spirit.* As much as this shocks common sense, his Lordship has his reason. *God has made the practice of morality our* INTEREST *as well as duty. But men, who find themselves constantly protected from the evils that fall on others, might grow insensibly to think themselves unconcerned in the common fate.*

God has made the practice of morality our INTEREST *as well as duty.* Without doubt he has. But does it not continue to be our *interest*, under an equal, as well as under an unequal Providence? Nay, is it not more evidently and invariably so, in the absence of those inequalities which hinder our seeing clearly, and feeling constantly, that *the practice of morality is our* INTEREST *as well as duty?*

—*But men who found themselves constantly protected from the evils that fall on others, might grow insensibly to think themselves unconcerned in the* COMMON FATE. What are those *evils*, under an equal Providence, which *fall on others*, and from which the good man is *protected?* Are they not the punishments inflicted on the wicked? And how is the good man protected from them? Is it not by his perseverance in Virtue? It is therefore impossible he should grow unconcerned to those evils which his Lordship calls the *common fate*, when he sees his *interest* and his duty so closely connected, that there is no way of avoiding those evils but by persevering in virtue. But the name of *common fate*, which he gives unto them, detects his prevarication. He pretends to reason against an equal Providence, yet slurs in upon us, in its stead, a *Providence which only protects good men; or rather one certain species of good men; and leaves all other to their* COMMON

* Vol. v. p. 429.

FATE. But admit it possible for the good man to *relax in his benevolence, and to grow insensible to the common fate:* there is, in *the state here assumed*, a speedy means of bringing him to himself; and that is, his being no longer *protected from the evils that fall on others:* for when men *relax in their benevolence*, his Lordship tells you, *they relax in their virtue:* and, give me leave to tell his Lordship, that when men relax in their virtue, an equal Providence relaxes in its protection; or, to speak more properly, the rewards of virtue are abated in proportion.

However, *spiritual pride* (he says) *might infect the virtuous thus protected:* And this he will prove *à fortiori*, from the case of ENTHUSIASTS; who only imagine they have this protection, and have it not. Now, what if we should say, it is this very *enthusiastic spirit* itself, and not the visions of *Protection* it is apt to raise, which is the true cause of *spiritual pride?* ENTHUSIASM is that temper of mind, in which the imagination has got the better of the judgment. In this disordered state of things, Enthusiasm, when it happens to be turned upon religious matters, becomes FANATICISM: and this, in its extreme, begets the fancy of our being the peculiar favourites of Heaven. Now, every one sees, that SPIRITUAL PRIDE is the *cause*, and not the *effect* of the disorder. For what but spiritual pride, springing out of presumptive holiness, could bring the Fanatic to fancy himself exalted above the common condition of the Faithful? It is true, when he is got thus far, the folly which brought him hither, may carry him further; and then, all to come will be indeed the effect of his disorder. But suppose it were not the enthusiastic Spirit, but the visions of protection, it is apt to raise, which is the cause of spiritual pride; Is there no difference between a *vision* and a *reality?* Fancy may occasion those disorders which Fact may remove. This, I persuade myself, is the case here: The real communication of Grace purifies those passions, and exalts them into virtues, which the strong delusion of such a state only renders more gross and violent. And here it may be worth while to take notice, that his Lordship, in this objection to an extraordinary Providence, from the hurt it does to general benevolence, seems to have had the *Jewish People* in his eye; who in the latter ages of their Republic were commonly charged, and perhaps not altogether unjustly, with want of benevolence to the rest of mankind: a fact, which though it makes nothing for his purpose, makes very much for mine, as it furnishes me with an example to support what is here said of Fanaticism; an infirmity pretty general amongst the Jews of those Ages. They had outlived their extraordinary Providence; but not the memory, nor even the effects of it; nay, the warmer tempers were hardly brought to think it had ceased. This filled them with spiritual pride, as the elect of God; a disposition which, it is confessed, tends readily to destroy or to *relax* general benevolence. But what now are the natural consequences, which the actual administration of an equal Providence would have on the human mind? In this case, as in the other, a warm temper, whose object was Religion, would be obnoxious to the common weakness of our nature, and too apt to disgrace itself by spiritual pride: but as this is one of the vices which an equal Providence is always at hand to punish, the cure would be direct and speedy. The reco-

vered Votary, we will now suppose to be received again into the number of the Good; and to find himself in the *little flock and chosen sheep*, as they are nick-named by this noble Writer. Well, but his danger is not yet over; the sense of this high prerogative of humanity might revive, in a warm temper, the still unmortified seeds of spiritual pride. Admit this to be the case; what follows? His pride revives indeed, but it is only to be again humbled: for punishment is still closely attendant on vice and folly. At length, this holy discipline, the necessary consequence of an equal Providence, effectually does its work; it purifies the mind from low and selfish partialities, and adorns the Will with general benevolence, public spirit, and love of all its fellow-creatures.

What then could support his Lordship in so perverse a judgment concerning the state and condition of good men under an equal Providence? That which supports all his other insults on Religion; his sophistical change of the question. He objects to an equal Providence (which, Religionists pretend, hath been administered during one period of the Dispensation of Grace) where good men are constantly rewarded, and wicked men as constantly punished; and he takes the matter of his objection from the fanatical idea of a *favoured elect* (which never existed but in over-heated brains), where reward and punishment are distributed, not on the proportions of merit and de-merit, but on the diabolic dreams of certain eternal decrees of election and reprobation, unrelated to any human principle of justice.

But now, Reader, keep the question steadily in your eye, and his Lordship's reasoning in this paragraph discloses such a complication of absurdities as will astonish you. You see an equal Providence, which, in and through the very act of rewarding benevolence, public spirit, and humility, becomes instrumental in producing, in those so rewarded, selfishness, neglect of the public, and spiritual pride.

His Lordship's last objection to an extraordinary Providence is, that it would NOT ANSWER ITS END.

"I will conclude this head" (says he) "by observing, that we have *example* as well as *reason* for us, when we reject the hypothesis of particular Providences. God was the king of the Jewish People. His presence resided amongst them, and his justice was manifested daily in rewarding and punishing by unequivocal, signal, and miraculous interpositions of his power. The effect of all was this, the People rebelled at one time and repented at another. Particular Providences, directed by God himself immediately, upon the spot, if I may say so, had particular temporal effects only, none general nor lasting: and the People were so little satisfied with this system of Government that they deposed the supreme Being, and insisted to have another King, and to be governed like their neighbours."*

In support of this last objection, the Reader sees, his Lordship was forced to throw off the mask, and fairly to tell us what he aimed at; that is to say, to discredit the extraordinary Providence mentioned by Moses. An equal Providence, says he, will not answer its *end*. What is its end? Here, his prevarications bring us, as usual, to our distinctions.—When this Providence

* Vol. v. p. 430.

is administered for the sake of *Particulars*, its first end is to discipline us in virtue, and keep us in our duty: When administered for the sake of a *Community*, its first end is to support the Institution it had erected. Now his Lordship, proceeding from reason to example, gives us this of the Jewish Republic, to prove that an equal or extraordinary Providence does not answer one or other or both these ends.

But it is unlucky for him, that here, where he employs the example, he cannot forbear, any more than in numberless other places of his writings, to tell us that he believes nothing of the matter.—*How long this Theocracy may be said to have continued* (says he) *I am quite unconcerned to know, and should be sorry to mispend my time in inquiring.* The example then is unreal, and only brought as an argument *ad hominem*. But, the misfortune is, that no laws of good reasoning will admit such an argument *ad hominem* on this question, *Of the* EFFECTS *of a* REAL *extraordinary Providence;* because the nature of the effects of a REAL Providence can never be fully discovered by the effects of a PRETENDED one. To say the truth, his Lordship is at present out of luck. For had he indeed believed the extraordinary Providence of the Jews to be *real*, his own representation of the case would, on his own principles, have proved it but *pretended*. For 'tis a principle with him, that where the means do not produce the end, such means (all pretences notwithstanding) are but human inventions. It is thus he argues against the Divinity of the Christian Religion; which he concludes to be an imposture from its not having effected that lasting reformation of manners, which he supposes was its principal design to accomplish.

So far as to the CHOICE of his example. He manages no better in the APPLICATION of it.

We have distinguished, concerning the *ends* of an extraordinary Providence. Let us suppose now, that his Lordship takes the principal end of the Jewish Theocracy to be the reformation of *Particulars*. He refers to their history, and pretends to shew they were not reformed. Now, whatever other consequences may attend this supposed Fact, the most obvious and glaring is this, That his Lordship, in proceeding from *reason* to *example*, has given us such an example as overturns or supersedes all his reasoning. According to his reasoning, an extraordinary Providence would tye virtue and good manners so fast down upon every Individual, that his very Will would be forced, and the merit of doing what he had not in his power to forbear, absolutely destroyed. The Reader would now perhaps expect his example should confirm this pretended Fact? Just otherwise. His example shews his fact to be a fiction, and that men remained as bad as ever.

But I have no need of taking any artificial advantage of his Lordship's bad reasoning. For, when we see it so constantly opposed to truth, it is far from being an additional discredit to it, that it is as constantly opposed to itself.

The truth indeed is, that the great and principal end of the JEWISH THEOCRACY, was to keep that People a separate nation, under their own Law and Religion, till the coming of the MESSIAH; and to prepare things

for his reception by preserving amongst them the doctrine of the UNITY. Now, to judge whether the Theocracy or extraordinary Providence effected its end, we have only to consider, Whether this people, to the coming of Christ, did continue a distinct Nation separated from all the other tribes of Mankind, and distinguished from them, by the worship of the one true God. And on enquiry, we shall find, they not only did continue thus distinct and distinguished, but have so continued ever since. A circumstance which, having no example amongst any other People, is sufficient to convince us, that there must have been some amazing power in that Theocracy, which could go on operating for so many ages after the extraordinary administration of it had ceased. Let us conclude therefore, that his Lordship having nothing to urge against the due efficacy of this extraordinary Providence, but that, *the people rebelled at one time and repented at another, and that this Providence had only temporary effects*, is the most ample confession of his defeat.

NOTES

ON

THE FIFTH BOOK.

P. 420. vol. ii. A. YET some writers against the Divine Legation will have it that from the very context [ver. 16, 17, *To Abraham and his seed were the promises made*, &c. *The* COVENANT *that was confirmed before of God in Christ*, &c.] it appears that St. Paul means, the Law was ADDED not barely to the Patriarchal Religion, but to *the promise of the inheritance, the covenant that was confirmed before of God;* and from thence, conclude that the Jewish Religion had the doctrine of a future state. This it is to have a retrospective view, and with a *microscopic eye!* For had they, when they went *one* step backward, but gone *two*, they would have seen, St. Paul could not possibly have had their meaning in view, for at ver. 15. he expresly says,—though it be but a MAN'S COVENANT [much less if it be GOD'S] *yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or* ADDETH *thereto.* The *Law* therefore mentioned as ADDED in the 19th verse, cannot be understood, in the Apostle's sense, as being added to the COVENANT *that was confirmed before of God in Christ*, or indeed to any thing, but to the Patriarchal Religion of the Unity.

P. 429. B. "Il [Ninus fils de Belus] ne peut être inventeur de l'idolatrie qui etoit bien plus ancienne ; je ne dis pas seulement en Egypte, mais même au dela de l'Euphrate, puisque Rachel deroba les Teraphims, &c. —Il faut aller en Egypte pour trouver sur cela quelque chose du mieux fondé. Grotius croit que, du temps de Joseph, l'idolatrie n'etoit point encore commune en Egypt. Cependant on voit des-lors dans ce pays un extrême attachement à la magie, à la divination, aux augures, à l'interpretation des songes, &c.—Moyse defend d'adorer aucune figure, ni de ce qui est visible dans les cieux, ni de ce qui est sur la terre, ni de ce qui est dans les eaux. Voilà la defense generale d'adorer les astres, les animaux, et les

poissons. Le veau d'or etoit une imitation du dieu Apis. La niche de Moloch, dont parle Amos, étoit apparemment portée avec une figure du soleil. Moyse defend aux Hebreux d'immoler aux boucs, comme ils ont fait autrefois. La mort en l'honneur duquel il defend de faire le deûil, etoit le même qu'Osiris. Beelphegor, aux mysteres duquel ils furent entrainez par les femmes de Madian, étoit Adonis. Moloch cruelle divinité, à laquelle on immoloit des victimes humaines, étoit commune du tems de Moyse, aussi-bien que ces abominables sacrifices. Les Chananeens adoroient des moûches et d'autres insectes, au rapport de l'auteur de la sagesse. Le même auteur nous parle des Egyptiens d'alors comme d'un peuple plongé dans toutes sortes d'abominations, et qui adoroit toutes sortes d'animaux, même les plus dangereux, et les plus nuisibles. Le pays de Chanaan étoit encore plus corrumpu. Moyse ordonne d'y abattre les autels, les bois sacrez, les idoles, les monumens superstitieux. Il parle des enclos, où l'on entretenoit un feu eternel en l'honneur du soleil. Voilà la plus indubitable epoque qui nous ayons de l'idolatrie. Mais ce n'est point une epoque qui nous en montre sa source et le commencement, ni même le progrès et l'avancement : elle nous présente une idolatrie achevée, et portée à son comble ; les astres, les hommes, les animaux mêmes adorez comme autant divinitez ; la magie, la divination, l'impieté au plus haut point où elles puissent aller : enfin le crime, et les desordres honteux, suites ordinaires du culte superstitieux et de regle." Calmet, Dissert. sur l'Origine de l'Idolatrie, tom. i. p. 431, 432. Thus far this learned writer. And without doubt, his account of the early and over-bearing progress of idolatry is exact. Another writer, who would pass for such, is in different sentiments. He thinks its rise and progress much lower. *If we look* (says he) *amongst the Canaanites, we shall find no reason to imagine that there was a religion different from that of Abraham. Abraham travelled up and down many years in this country, and was respected by the inhabitants of it, as a person in great favour with God*, &c. And again, *Abraham was entertained by Pharaoh without the appearance of any indisposition towards him, or any the least sign of their having a different religion from that which Abraham himself professed and practised.* [Connect. of Sac. and Prof. Hist. vol. i. p. 309, and 312.] But here the learned author was deceived by mere modern ideas. He did not reflect on that general principle of *intercommunity*, so essential to paganism, which made all its followers disposed to receive the God of Abraham as a true, though tutelary, Deity. Josephus (the genius of whose times could not but give him a right notion of this matter) saw well the consistency between the veneration paid to Abraham's God, and the idolatry of the venerators ; as appears from his making that Patriarch the first who propagated the belief of one God, after the whole race of mankind was sunk into idolatry ; and at the same time making all those with whom he had to do, pay reverence to his God. Of Abraham he thus speaks, Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ φρονεῖν ἐπ' ἀρετῇ μείζω τῶν ἄλλων ἠργμένος, καὶ τὴν περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ δόξαν, ἣν ἅπασι συνέβαινεν εἶναι, καινίσαι καὶ μεταβαλεῖν ἔγνω. Πρῶτος οὖν τολμᾷ Θεὸν ἀποφήνασθαι δημιουργὸν τῶν ὅλων ἕνα. l. i. c. 7. He makes the idolatrous priests of Egypt tell Pharaoh at once, that the pestilence was sent from God in punishment for his intended violation of the stranger's wife : κατὰ μῆνιν Θεοῦ τὸ δεινὸν αὐτῷ παρεῖναι ἀπεσήμαινον οἱ ἱερεῖς, ἐφ' οἷς ἐθέλησεν ἐνύβρισαι τοῦ ξένου τὴν γυναῖκα. c. 8. And Abimelech, in the same circumstances, as ready to own the same author of his punishment. Φράζει πρὸς τοὺς φίλους, ὡς ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῷ ταύτην ἐπαγάγοι τὴν νόσον ὑπὲρ ἐκδικίας τοῦ ξένου φυλάσσων ἀνύβριστον αὐτῷ τὴν γυναῖκα. c. 12. Antiq.

P. 434. C. These considerations will lead us to a right apprehension of that part of the history of Jesus, where James and John, on the inhospitable behaviour of a village of Samaria, say to their Master, in the Legal spirit of the Jewish œconomy, *Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them, even as Elias did? But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.* [Luke ix. 54, 55, 56.] *i. e.* You consider not that you are no longer under the Dispensation of Works (in which a severity of this kind was just and necessary), but, of Grace, in which all restraint and punishment of opinions would be mischievous and unlawful. Here we see the very disposition to intolerance in James and John is severely censured. Yet the same temper in Paul, even when proceeding into act, is passed over without reproof, when Jesus, after his resurrection, is pleased to reveal his truth to him in a miraculous manner. Our Lord, instead of condemning the nature of the practice, only assures him of the vanity of its effects, *It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.* [Acts ix. 5.] The reason of this different treatment is evident. James and John had given their names to the Religion of Jesus, in which all force was unjust. Paul was yet of the Religion of Moses, where restraint was lawful. On this account it is that this Apostle, when speaking of his merits as a Jew, expresses himself in this manner, *For ye have heard of my conversation in time past; how that beyond measure I* PERSECUTED *the church of God, and wasted it: and* PROFITED *in the Jew religion above many my equals in mine own nation.* [Gal. i. 13.] Here he makes the *persecution* and the *profiting* to go hand in hand. And again, *Though I might also have confidence in the flesh. If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more: Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the Law, a Pharisee; concerning zeal,* PERSECUTING THE CHURCH; *touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless. But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ.* [Phil. iii. 4.] Here he glories in the action, as plainly meritorious. And so indeed it was in a Jew, as appears from the commendations given to it in the case of Phineas, and others. Yet where he speaks of it, under his present character of a Christian, he condemns it as horrid and detestable; and this, in order to shew his followers how it ought to be regarded in the Religion of Jesus. To the Corinthians he says, *I am the least of the Apostles; that am not meet to be called an Apostle, because I* PERSECUTED *the church of God.* [1 Ep. xv. 9.] And to *Timothy, I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry; who was before a blasphemer and a* PERSECUTOR, *and injurious. But I obtained mercy, because I did it in* IGNORANCE *and* UNBELIEF, [1 Ep. i. 12.] *i. e.* being a Jew.

P. 438. D. Dr. Stebbing, though he differs from Mr. Foster in most other matters, yet agrees with him in this, "That the justice and equity of the Jewish Law in punishing Idolaters with death, did not depend on the particular form of government." [*Hist. of Abraham.*] In which he is much more consistent than his dissenting neighbour. For the doctor approves of persecution for opinions; whereas the minister pretends to condemn it.

P. 440. E. It is strange to consider how much Dr. *Spencer* has mistaken this matter, where, in his reasons of a Theocracy *ex parte seculi*, as he calls them, he gives the following: "Seculi moribus ita factum erat, ut Dii sui principatum quendam inter servos suos obtinerent, et nomine rituque regio colerentur. Nam seculo illo Deos titulis illis *Moloch*, *Elohim*,

Baalim, et hujusmodi aliis, regibus et magnatibus tribui solitis, insignire solebant: eos imperii arbitros plerumque ponebant, cum nec bella gerere, nec civitatem condere, nec regem eligere, nec grandius aliquid moliri solerent, priusquam Deos per oracula vel auspicia consuluissent." Dissert. de Theoc. Jud. c. iii. p. 237. Ed. Chap. But these are no marks that the Pagans attributed any kind of civil regality to their Gods. As to their regal titles, those were what they had retained from the time of their real kingship in the state of humanity. And as to the consulting their oracles on all public affairs of moment, this was the consequence of Pagan religion's having *a public as well as private part*. But, for an acknowledged God to be chosen and received by any people as their real Monarch or Civil Magistrate, was a thing altogether unknown to Paganism. The learned Marsham, with his usual bias, endeavours to insinuate, that the institution of a *Theocracy* was an imitation of Pagan Custom.—"Moses pridem Θεοκρατίαν declaravit Ebræorum Rempublicam; ne sibi potestas regia deferretur: Athenienses autem Διοκρατίαν suam ab Apolline retulerunt; ut *regis* nomen *Jovi* cederet; neque tam titulus quam potestas regia imminueretur." Sec. xiii. p. 340.—But the question here is not about the *name*, but the *thing*. The Pagans might call their national Gods by the name of Kings, and, by a bolder figure, might call their Government, put under the protection of a tutelary Deity, by the name of a *Theocracy;* but a real Theocracy is that only where the Laws of the Institution have all a reference to the actual rule of a tutelary God, whether the true God or false ones; and such a Theocracy is no where to be found but in the land of Judea.

P. 456. F. For this was the only use the Pagans ever thought of making of the Gods of their enemies when they had stolen them, or taken them away by force. Apion had mentioned one Zabidus an Idumean, who, when the Jews were warring against his countrymen, made a bargain with the enemy to deliver Apollo, one of their tutelary Gods, into their hands; and Josephus, when he comes to confute this idle tale, takes it for granted that the only supposed cause of such pretended traffic was to gain a new tutelary Deity; and on this founds his argument against Apion: *How then*, says he, *can Apion persist in accusing us of not having Gods in common with others, when our forefathers were so easily persuaded to believe that Apollo was coming into their service?* Τί δ' ἡμῶν ἔτι κατηγορεῖ τὸ μὴ κοινοὺς ἔχειν τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοὺς, εἰ ῥᾳδίως οὕτως ἐπείσθησαν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, ἥξειν τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα πρὸς αὐτούς; Vol. ii. p. 478.

P. 470. G. I call them licentious, principally, for the extravagant Reasonings concerning the authority of the Pentateuch, and the divine inspiration of Scripture. The first he retracted and confuted, when the spirit of contradiction had given way to better principles; the other (which he had inserted into the *Letters* as the work of another man) he never, that I know of, atoned for, by any retraction whatsoever.

P. 475. H. Dr. Sykes has undertaken to confute the censure here passed upon Dr. Spencer. *Here it is* (says this Answerer) *that Mr. W. attacks Dr. Spencer's dissertation on the Jewish Theocracy. Are we not now from hence to* IMAGINE *that Dr. Spencer was one of those writers that supposed the Theocracy to have ended with the Judges?* [An examination of Mr. W's account, &c. p. 168.] What demands of *imagination* his trade of Answering may have upon him, I do not know. But from my words, a fair reasoner would *imagine* nothing but that I meant to prove what I said: namely, that Dr. Spencer's discourse of the Theocracy is *weak and inconsistent*.

His first charge (says he) *against Spencer is, that he thought the Theocracy*

was established by degrees, and abrogated by degrees. "A conceit highly absurd," *says Mr. W. But wherein lies the absurdity of this gradual progress and gradual declension?* [p. 170.] The *Absurdity* lies here. When God is pleased to assume the character of civil Magistrate, he must, like all other Magistrates, enter upon his office at once, and (as common sense requires) abdicate it at once. Now the Government under such a Magistrate is what we properly call a Theocracy. Therefore to talk of *the gradual progress* and *gradual declension* of this mode of civil relation, is the same as to talk of the gradual progress and gradual declension of Paternity, or any other mode of natural relation; of which, I suppose, till now, nobody ever heard.

He goes on—*if there be any absurdity or inconsistency, in this manner of speaking, it may be* JUSTIFIED *by Mr. W's own authority.* That is, my absurdity will justify another Man's. But this is doing me an honour which I do not pretend to. Well, but how do I *justify* Dr. Spencer? Why, I say, it seems, "that in the period immediately preceding the Jewish Captivity, on the gradual withdrawing the extraordinary Providence from them, they began to entertain doubts concerning God's further peculiar regard to them as his chosen People." *So that here* (says Dr. Sykes) *he expresly owns a* GRADUAL WITHDRAWING OF THE EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE from the Jews. *And where is the absurdity of Dr. Spencer's* GRADUAL DECLENSION OR IMMINUTION OF THE THEOCRACY, *which Mr. W's gradual withdrawing of the extraordinary Providence is not liable unto? Or was not the gradual withdrawing of the extraordinary Providence a proper imminution of the Theocracy?* [p. 171.] He is so pleased with this argument that he repeats it at p. 218. Yet who would have suspected him of what he here discovers, a total ignorance of any difference between the FORM of Government and the ADMINISTRATION of it? Now Dr. Spencer talked of the gradual decline of the *form of Government*, which I thought absurd: I spoke of the gradual decline of the *administration* of it; which, whether it be equally absurd, let those determine who have seen (unless perhaps the rarity of the fact has made it escape observation) an *administration* of Government grow worse and worse, while the *form* of it still continued the same.

So much as to Spencer's *absurdity*. We come next to his *inconsistency*, in supposing some foot-steps of the Theocracy till the time of Christ, and yet that it was entirely abrogated by the establishment of the Kings. Of this inconsistency, Dr. Spencer is absolved, by the dexterity of our Answerer, in the following manner: *Here again is Dr. Spencer much misrepresented, from not considering* WHAT HE MEANT *by the* ABROGATION *of God's Government. Not that the Theocracy entirely ceased; but the Government received an* ALTERATION *and* ABATEMENT. *And therefore he uses more than once the phrase of* REGIMINIS MUTATI, *in this very section; Where is the absurdity and inconsistency of this way of reasoning, unless abrogation is made to signify a total abolition, and duration is to be construed cessation?*

He asks, *where is the absurdity of this way of reasoning?* I did not accuse Spencer of *absurdity in his way of reasoning*, but of *contradiction in his way of expression.* I see no *reasoning* there is, or can be, in a man's delivering what he thinks a fact: such as his opinion of the duration of a form of Government. But he who cannot distinguish *reasoning* from *expression*, may be well excused for confounding the *form of Government*, and the *administration of Government* with one another.

However, *Spencer* (he says) *is much misrepresented; he did not mean by* ABROGATION *a* CEASING; *but an* ALTERATION *and* ABATEMENT. It seems then,

a writer is *much misrepresented* if, when he is charged with an inconsistent *expression*, his *meaning* may be proved consistent. A good commodious principle for the whole class of Answerers! But he tells us that *abrogation* [regimen abrogatum] does not signify *ceasing*. Where did he get his Latin? for the Roman writers use it only in the sense of dissolution, abolition, or the *entire ceasing* of an office or command. What then does it signify? ALTERATION (he says) *and* ABATEMENT. But now where did he get his English? Our Country writers, I think, use the word *alteration* to signify a change; and *abatement*, to signify no change; no alteration in the qualities of things, but a diminution only in the vigour of their operations. What the *alteration* of a Theocracy, or any other form of Government is, we well understand; but what the *abatement* of it is, one is much at a loss to conceive. However, this I know, that Dr. Sykes here confirms what I charge upon him, the confounding the mode of Government with the administration of it: *Alteration* being applicable to the former, and *abatement*, only to the latter.

But his inference from this special reasoning, is worth all the rest—*and* THEREFORE *Spencer uses, more than once, the phrase of* regiminis MUTATI, *in this very section. Therefore!* Wherefore? Why, because by *abrogati* he meant only *abated*, therefore he *uses* mutati, *more than once* to explain himself. That is to say, "because, by *totum*, I mean *pars*, THEREFORE I use *omne* more than once, to explain my meaning." Well, if he did not clear it up before, he has done it now.

—*And where* (says he) *is the absurdity or inconsistency of this way of reasoning?* Nay, for that matter, the *reasoning* is full as good as the Criticism. But here he should have stopped; for so fatal is his expression, where the fit of Answering is upon him, that he cannot ask quarter for one blunder without committing another—*Unless* ABROGATION *is made to signify a* TOTAL ABOLITION, *and* duration *is construed to be* cessation.—"I can find" (says he) "no absurdity nor inconsistency in Dr. Spencer, without perverting the common signification of words:"—*without calling duration cessation.*—This is his Argument; and so far was well. But he goes on—*and abrogation, a total abolition.* Here he sinks again; for *abrogation* was *abolition*, amongst all nations and languages, till Dr. Sykes first pleaded in *abatement*. Well, but our Answerer will go farther: and having so ably vindicated Dr. Spencer, he will now shew, though the Dr. be *consistent*, yet so am not I: for that I hold, the extraordinary Providence entirely ceased on the return from the Captivity: From whence (says this subtle logician) I argue thus, "If the EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE entirely ceased *on the full Settlement of the Jews after their Return*, it ceased some centuries at least before the days of Christ; and CONSEQUENTLY the THEOCRACY must have ceased some centuries before the days of Christ. How then is Mr. W. consistent about the duration of the Theocracy, since he pleads for its continuance till Christ's time, and yet maintains that IT entirely ceased so long before his time?" *

The argument, we see, gathers even as it rolls from his mouth. In the beginning of the sentence, The *ceasing of an extraordinary Providence* only implied in consequence, the *ceasing of the Theocracy;* but, before we get to the end, an *extraordinary Providence* and a *Theocracy* are one and the same thing. "*Mr.* W. *pleads for its* [a Theocracy's] *continuance till Christ's time, and yet maintains that* IT *entirely ceased so long before his time.*" Thus again to the same purpose at p. 178. "Or by what rule does he form a judgment that WHAT was gradually decaying to the Captivity, was entirely

* "Examination of Mr. W.'s Account," &c. pp. 173, 174.

to cease after their Return and full Settlement; and yet WAS to continue till Christ's time?"—Nay, if he begins to talk of *Rules*, let me ask him *by what Rule* he found out, "that a *Monarchy* and an exact *Administration of Justice* are one and the same thing?" The truth is, our Examiner was thus grievously misled by the ambiguity of the *English* word THE GOVERNMENT; which signifies either the MODE of Civil Policy, or the ADMINISTRATION of it. But was this to be expected of a man who had been all his life-time writing ABOUT GOVERNMENT?

To conclude this long note, The charge against SPENCER was of *absurdity* and *contradiction* in one single instance amidst a thousand excellencies. Dr. Sykes assumes the honour of his Defence. But with what judgment, he soon gives us to understand, when he could find no other part of that immortal Book to do himself the credit of supporting, but the *discourse concerning the Theocracy;* much in the spirit of that ancient Advocate of Cicero, who, while the Patriot's character was torn in pieces by his Enemies, would needs vindicate him from the imputation of a Wart upon his Nose, against his Friends.

P. 496. I. It was one of the principal Accusations which *Apion*, at that time, brought against the *Jews*, that they would not have Gods in common with other Nations; as we learn from Josephus's tract against him, τί δ' ἡμῶν ἔτι κατηγορεῖ τὸ μὴ κοινοὺς ἔχειν τοῖς ἄλλοις θεούς; Vol. ii. p. 477, 478. And *Celsus* calls that famous maxim, *A man cannot serve two Masters* (on which he supposed *Christians* founded the same principle) THE VOICE OF SEDITION when men are for breaking off all society and commerce with the rest of mankind. Εἶθ' ἑξῆς ἐκείνοις ἡμᾶς εἰσάγει λέγοντας πρὸς τὴν ἐπαπόρησιν αὐτοῦ, θέλοντος ἡμᾶς καὶ τοὺς Δαίμονας θεραπεύειν, ὅτι οὐκ οἰόντε δουλεύειν τὸν αὐτὸν πλείοσι κυρίοις. Τοῦτο δ', ὡς οἴεται ΣΤΑΣΕΩΣ εἶναι ΦΩΝΗΝ, τῶν (ὡς αὐτὸς ὠνόμασεν) ἀποτειχιζόντων ἑαυτοὺς καὶ ἀπορρηγνύντων ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Orig. cont. Cels.* p. 380.

P. 496. K. In his Tract against *Apion* he has these remarkable words: *It is becoming Men of prudence and moderation carefully to observe their own Country Laws concerning Religious matters, and to avoid calumniating the customs of others. But this Man* [Apion] *abandoned his own Religion, and has since employed himself in inventing lies of ours.* Δεῖ γὰρ τοὺς εὐφρονοῦντας τοῖς μὲν οἰκείοις νόμοις περὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν ἀκριβῶς ἐμμένειν, τοὺς δὲ τῶν ἄλλων μὴ λοιδορεῖν· ὁ δὲ τούτους μὲν ἔφυγε, τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ κατεψεύσατο. Vol. ii. p. 480. This was carrying his complaisance to the Gentiles extremely far. But the necessity was pressing; and he misses no opportunity of conciliating their good-will. Thus in his *Antiquities*, a work, as we observed, entirely apologetical, he tells the Reader, l. iii. c. 6. that the seven branches of the golden Candlestick signified the *seven Planets*. But in his *Wars of the Jews*, l. vii. c. 5. § 5. he assures us they signify the Reverence in which the *Jews* held the *Number Seven*. But, Allegory for Allegory, he thought, I suppose, one as good as the other, and therefore might be allowed to use what best served his occasions.

P. 496. L. The Jews succeeded in their endeavours to distinguish Their case from the Christians. So that while the storm fell upon the latter, the other enjoyed a calm. As we may fully understand by that passage in St. Paul to the Galatians; *As many as desire to make a fair shew in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised, only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ*, c. vi. 12. On which Limborch observes very justly,—"Qui non zelo pietatis, aut pro lege Mosis, moti id urgebant; sed tantum ut placerent Judæis; quia nempe videbant persecutiones quotidie magis magisque Christianis a Gentibus inferri, *Judæos autem ab illis esse immunes*,

hac ratione eas, tanquam ipsi essent Judæi, studuerunt declinare." *Amica Collatio*, p. 164.

P. 497. M. "There is, amongst many other things that *Josephus's* copy appears to want, one omission of so important a nature—the heinous Sin of the golden Calf.—What makes it stranger is this, that *Josephus's* account is not only negative, by a bare omission, but positive, by affording an exact coherence without it, *nay such a coherence as is plainly inconsistent with it.* And what still makes it more surprising is, that *Josephus* frequently professes, neither to add to nor to take away from the sacred Books." *Dissert.* II. p. xlv. Some other Liberties, which *Josephus* took with Scripture for the end above explained, made this learned Writer conclude that the Historian had an *earlier and more uncorrupt copy of the Old Testament than any we now have: for that his accounts are more exact, consistent, and agreeable with Chronology, with natural Religion, and with one another*, p. xxxv. Yet, after all, the fatal omission of the golden Calf brings him to confess, *that* Josephus's *copy appears to* WANT *many things* which are in ours, p. xlv. Thus sorely distressed is this good man in the support of a wild extravagant hypothesis; while every one else sees that all the omissions and alterations (which sometimes make this copy *good*, sometimes *bad*) were designed deviations from the sacred Volumes to conciliate the good-will of his masters.

P. 500. N. Here Dr. Sykes appears again upon the stage. "The Scripture representation of the Theocracy, as Mr. Warburton" (says he) "assures us, was, 1. *Over the State in general:* and 2. *Over private Men in particular.* I have no doubts about the former of these cases: For where a law was given by God, and he condescended to become King of a Nation, and a solemn Covenant was entered into by the People and by God, as their King, and where blessings were solemnly promised upon obedience to the Law, or curses were denounced upon disobedience: and this by one who was able to execute whatever he engaged; no doubt can be about the reciprocal obligations, or about God's performing his part of the obligation, since it is his property not to lie nor deceive. Temporal Rewards and Punishments being then the sanction of the Jewish Law, these must be dispensed by God so as to make the State happy and flourishing if they keep the Law, or else miserable if they disobeyed it. The Blessings and Curses were general and national, agreeable to the character of a King, and a legal Administration: such as related to them as a People; and not to particular persons." [Exam. of Mr. W.'s account, &c. p. 186, 187.]

Here, he assures us, *he has no doubts about the extraordinary Providence over the State in general.* And he tells us his reason,—Because *the Law was given by God, and he condescended to become the* KING *of the Nation, by a solemn Covenant made with the People.* Now if this very reason be found to hold equally strong for an extraordinary Providence over PARTICULARS, the point will be soon decided between us. Let me ask him then, what those reasons are whereby he infers that, from *God's becoming King of a Nation*, he must administer an extraordinary Providence over the *State in general*, which do not equally conclude for God's administering it over *Particulars?* Is not his inference founded upon this, That where God condescends to assume a *civil* character, he condescends to administer it in a *civil* manner? which is done by extending his care over the whole. If our Doctor should say, his inference is not thus founded; I must then beg leave to tell him, that he has no foundation at all to conclude from God's being *King*, that there was an extraordinary Providence exerted over the *State in general.* If he confesses that it is thus founded; then I infer, upon the same grounds, an extraordinary Providence over *Particulars.* For the justice of the Regal

office is equally pledged to extend its care to *Particulars* as well as to the *general*. It may be asked then, what hindered our Doctor from seeing so self-evident a truth? I reply, the mistake with which he first set out; and which yet sticks to him. I have observed before, what confusion he ran into by not being able to distinguish between the *Form of Government* and the *Administration of it*. Here again he makes the same blind work, from not seeing the difference between a LEGISLATOR and a KING.—*For where a* LAW (says he) *was given by God, and he condescended to become the* KING *of a Nation*, &c. implying that in his opinion, the *giving a Law*, and the *becoming a King*, was one and the same thing. Hence it was, that as the Legislative power, in the institution of good Laws, extends its providence only over the State in general, he concluded, that the executive power, in the administration of those Laws, does no more. Which brings him to a conclusion altogether worthy both of himself and his premises. *The Blessings and Curses* (says he) *were general and national, agreeable to the character of a King and a legal Administration.*—What! Is it only agreeable to the character of a King and a legal Administration to take care of the *State in general*, and not of *Particulars?* So, according to this new system of Policy, it is agreeable to the Constitution of *England* to fit out fleets, to protect the public from insults, and to enact Laws to encourage commerce; but not to erect Courts of Equity, or to send about itinerant Judges. What makes his ignorance in this matter the more inexcusable is, that I had pointed out to him this distinction, in the following passage; the former part of which he has quoted, but dropt the latter, as if determined that neither himself nor his reader should be the better for it. My words are these: *It* [the extraordinary Providence] *is represented as administered*, 1. *Over the State in general.* 2. *Over private men in particular. And such a representation we should expect to find from the nature of the Republic;* BECAUSE AS AN EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE OVER THE STATE NECESSARILY FOLLOWS GOD'S BEING THEIR TUTELARY DEITY [in which capacity he gave them Laws], so AN EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE TO PARTICULARS FOLLOWS AS NECESSARILY FROM HIS BEING THEIR SUPREME MAGISTRATE [in which capacity he administered them].

P. 500. O. To this it has been objected, "That Solomon here prays for scarce so much in behalf of his own People, as he doth, ver. 32, for every *stranger* that shall come and worship in the Temple." But the Objector should have observed that there is this difference,—the prayer for the Israelites was founded on a Covenant; the prayer for the Stranger, on no Covenant. That for the Israelites begins thus, *O Lord God of Israel there is no God like thee, which* KEEPETH COVENANT—and as he proceeds, the reason of his petition all along goes upon their being possessors of the *promised Land*, the great object of the Covenant, ver. 25-27-31. But the prayer for the *Stranger*, ver. 32, is founded altogether on another principle, namely, for the sake of God's glory amongst the heathen. *Moreover concerning the Stranger* [words implying a new consideration] *if they come and pray in this house, then hear from the Heavens*—THAT ALL PEOPLE OF THE EARTH MAY KNOW THY NAME AND FEAR THEE.

P. 501. P. But the whole book of Psalms is one continued declaration of the administration of an extraordinary Providence to particulars, in the exact distribution of rewards and punishments. See the *Argument of the Divine Legation fairly stated*, p. 57 to 75, where the learned Writer has evinced the truth in question beyond the possibility of a reply.

P. 501. Q. To this testimony from Ezekiel, Dr. Sykes objects that "It is but a parabolical command: and no argument can be drawn from

parables for an equal Providence over particulars, but at most for a particular and peculiar Dispensation." *Defence*, p. 61. This is the pleasantest of Answerers.—If this *parabolical command* does not mean what itself says it does mean, namely, "that virtuous individuals should be distinguished from the wicked, in a general calamity;" what then does it mean? Why, *at most, but a particular and peculiar Dispensation.* And in what, I pray you, does a *particular and peculiar Dispensation* consist, if not in a distinction between the virtuous and the wicked, in a general calamity? But he had some confused notion that there was a difference between a parabolical and a real representation: and therefore he makes it to consist in this, that *no argument can be drawn from* the former.—Now, if from Jesus's parable of the rebellious Husbandmen (who wounded their Lord's Servants and killed the Heir, and for their pains were ejected from their possessions, and the vineyard let to other Husbandmen) I should conclude, that he meant the Jews, who had murdered the Prophets which were sent unto them, and were ready to murder the Messiah likewise, and that for this crime they should be deprived of the blessing of the Gospel, and the Gentiles received into the Kingdom of Christ, in their stead, I make no doubt but, if it served our Doctor's purpose of *answering*, he would reply, *It is but a parabolic tale, and no argument can be drawn from parables, of Christ's sufferings and the rejection of the Jews, &c. but, at most, that the Jews were rebels and murderers, and would be treated as such.*

Another Answerer is yet more shameless. "As to the parabolical command in Ezekiel" (says Dr. Rutherforth) "the very same promises were exactly fulfilled to the Christians. *Rev.* vii. 1, 2, 3." If you ask *when*, *where*, and *how*, you would embarras, but not disconcert him. Yet, as he assures us, these promises were exactly fulfilled to Christians, he must give us leave to assure him, that it could be only in a *spiritual* sense: for St. Paul tells us, that the Jews had the *promise of the life that now is*, and the Christians of *that which is to come.* I doubt then the learned Professor was a little disoriented when he called the *promises* in Ezekiel and in the Revelations, *the same.* There is a strange perversity in these men. The promises under the *Law*, they tell us, are to be understood SPIRITUALLY, and this, in order that they may bring Judaism to Christianity: But then, to bring Christianity back to Judaism, they tell us on the other hand, that the promises under the *Gospel* are to be understood CARNALLY. But what is to be expected, or rather what is not to be expected, from a man who dares to assert, that there was no more an extraordinary Providence under the Jewish than under the Christian Dispensation; in open defiance of the Prophets and the Apostles, of Moses and of Jesus Christ.

P. 502. R. Yet Dr. Sykes scruples not to say, "The passage from Amos does not prove an *equal* or *unequal* Providence, but a peculiar interposition OCCASIONALLY administered." Def. p. 61. As I would be willing that every thing of this learned Answerer's should be put to use, I would recommend this observation to the reader as a paraphrase on the words of the Apostle, where he says that, under the Mosaic Dispensation, "the word spoken by Angels was STEDFAST, and EVERY transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward." Heb. ii. 2.

P. 502. S. To this Dr. Sykes replies, "The equal providence over the Jews by his own confession had ceased some hundred of years, and therefore at the writing of this epistle, *Tribulation* was deemed by no body more an opprobrium of the Jews, or a punishment of their crimes, than it was of other people." Defence, p. 62. This great Divine did not perceive that St. Paul is here speaking of the different *genius* of the two Religions, Judaism

and Christianity, not of the *condition* of the two People at the time he wrote: and consequently, as what was once true would be always true, the Apostle considers the *nature* of the two Dispensations as invariable.

P. 505. T. The Writer of the *first Book of Maccabees* appears to have lived in the times he wrote of; and we find no wonders nor prodigies in his History. But a long time after comes the Author of the *second Book*, an Epitomizer of one *Jason* of *Syrene;* and he largely supplies what he thought the other wanted. This Man is such a lover of prodigies, that, when he has made a monstrous lye, and so frightened himself at the size of it that he dare not tell it out, he insinuates it [as Chap. xii. ver. 22.—ἐκ τῆς τοῦ παντα ἐφορῶντος ἐπιφανείας. Chap. xv. ver. 27. τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιφανείᾳ.] Nay he even ventures at an apology for *lying Wonders*, [Chap. xv. ver. 11.] and under this encouragement falls a lying to some purpose, [Chap. xii. ver. 16.]

P. 507. U. I will only observe at present, what the least reflection on this matter so naturally suggests, that this *complaint of inequality* never could have come from *good men*, as it did even from *Jeremiah* himself, who thus expostulates with the Almighty: *Righteous art thou, O Lord, when I plead with thee: yet let me talk with thee of thy judgments: Wherefore doth the way of the Wicked prosper? Wherefore are all they happy that deal very treacherously?* [Chap. xii. ver. 1.] It never, I say, could have come from such men, had they been *at all acquainted* with the Doctrine *of a future state of rewards and punishments;* or had they not been *long accustomed* to an *extraordinary Providence.*

P. 508. X. Mr. Chubb, in some or other of his Tracts, has, as I remember, made an unusual effort; an effort to be witty. He observes, that the Author of the *Divine Legation* has done the Unbeliever's business for him; "by proving that an equal Providence was *promised;* while the Bible shews that it was not *performed.*" But he might have known, that the Author did not furnish Infidelity with this foolish objection; it lay open to them. And he might have seen, that the folly of it was here effectually exposed. However, Mr. Chubb was a very extraordinary personage; and might have said with the reasoning Rustic in Moliere,—"Oui, si j'avois étudié j'aurois été songer à des choses où l'on n'a jamais songé." As it was, he did wonders. He began with defending the reasonableness of Christianity, and carried on his work so successfully, that, before he gave over, he had reasoned himself out of Religion.

P. 1. vol. iii. Y. The Atheist *Vanini*, indeed, seems to rank Moses in the number of those Politicians, who, he says, promised a *future state* that the cheat might never be found out.—"In unica naturæ lege, quam *natura*, quæ Deus est *(est enim principium motus)* in omnium gentium animis inscripsit. Cæteras vero leges non nisi figmenta et illusiones esse asserebant, non a cacodæmone aliquo inductas, *fabulosum namque illorum genus dicitur a philosophis*, sed a *principibus ad subditorum pædagogiam excogitatas*, et a sacrificulis ob honoris et auri aucupium confirmatas, non miraculis, *sed scriptura, cujus nec originale ullibi adinvenitur, quæ miracula facta recitet*, et bonarum ac malarum actionum repromissiones polliceatur, *in futura tamen vita*, ne fraus detegi possit."—*De admirandis naturæ arcanis.*

P. 3. Z. The miserable efforts of these men to evade the force of a little plain sense is deplorable. "Moses" (says one of them) "could not omit the mention of the *Devil* for the reason given by the author of the D. L. because he mentions him expressly, and represents him as the patron, if not as the author, of idolatry." Deut. xxxii. ver. 17. *Rutherforth's Essays*, p. 294.—The words of Moses are these,—*They sacrificed to* Devils, *not to God; to Gods whom they knew not, to new Gods that came newly up, whom*

your fathers feared not. The Hebrew word here translated *Devils*, is *Schedim*, which, the best interpreters tell us, has another signification. The true God being *Schaddei*, the *omnipotent and all-sufficient*, the Gentile Gods, by a beautiful opposition, are called *Schedim, counterfeit Gods.* And the context, where they are called *new Gods*, shews this interpretation to be the true. But admit that, by Schedim is to be understood *evil spirits:* by these spirits are not meant fallen Angels, but the souls of wicked men. These were the *Demons* of Paganism; but the *Devils* discovered by Revelation have a different nature and original: Accordingly, the Septuagint, which took *Schedim* in the sense of the souls of wicked men, translates it by δαιμόνια.

P. 5. AA. Dr. Sykes in disputing with me, as we have seen above, on this question, *Whether the extraordinary Providence was only over the State in general, or whether it extended to Particulars*, having sufficiently puzzled himself and his reader; To recover the ground he had lost, on a sudden changes the question, and now tells us, that it is, "*Whether an extraordinary Providence was administered to Particulars* IN SUCH A MANNER *that no transgressor of the Law escaped punishment, nor any observer of the Law missed his reward;*"—"which Mr. Warburton represents" (says he) "to be the state of the Jews under an equal Providence." [Exam. p. 187, 188.] Now what his drift was in this piece of management, is easily understood. It was to introduce a commodious Fallacy under an ambiguous expression; which would be always at hand to answer his occasions. And indeed, the cautious reader (and I would advise no other to have to do with him) will suspect no less, when he observes that the words, [*no Transgressor escaped punishment, nor any Observer of the Law missed his Reward*] quoted from me, are not to be found in that place where I state the nature of the extraordinary Providence; but here, where I speak of the consequences of it, in the words above—*We have shewn at large*, &c. What now has this ANSWERER done? He has taken the words [*no Transgressor escaping Punishment, nor any Observer of the Law missing his Reward*] from their natural place; misrepresented their purpose; and given them to the reader as my DEFINITION of an extraordinary Providence to Particulars. And not content with all this, he has put a false and sophistical sense upon them, *viz.* THAT NO ONE SINGLE PERSON, WITHOUT EXCEPTION, ever escaped Punishment, or missed his Reward. And in this sense, by the vilest prevarication, he repeats and applies them, on every following occasion, as the sole answer to all my reasonings on the subject of an extraordinary Providence. It will be proper then to shew, that the words could not mean, by any rules of just construction, that every *single person, without exception*, was thus punished and rewarded; but only that this extraordinary Providence over Particulars was so exactly administered, that no one could hope to escape it, or fear to be forgotten by it.

First then, let it be observed, that the words are no absolute assertion; but a consequence of something asserted.—AND THEN *no Transgressor escaping*, etc. which illative words the honest Examiner omitted.—What I had asserted was simply this, that the extraordinary Providence over the Jews was in Scripture represented as administered over Particulars; but that this very administration would of necessity be attended with some inequalities. Must not then the consequence I draw from these premises be as restrained as the premises themselves? Secondly, I said, that God had promised an equal Providence to Particulars, but that he had declared, at the same time, how it should be administered, *viz.* in such a manner as would occasion some few exceptions. If therefore Dr. Sykes would not allow me, he ought to have allowed God Almighty at least, to explain his own meaning.

Thirdly, had the words been absolute, as they then might have admitted of two senses, did not common ingenuity require, that I should be understood in that which was the easiest to prove, when either was alike to my purpose? But there was still more than this to lead an ingenuous man into my meaning; which was, that he might observe, that I used, throughout my whole discourse of the Jewish Œconomy, the words *extraordinary Providence* and *equal Providence*, as equivalent terms. By which he might understand that I all along admitted of exceptions. Fourthly, If such rare cases of exception destroyed an equal Providence to *Particulars*, (which Providence I hold) it would destroy, with it, the equal Providence to the *State*, (which Dr. Sykes pretends to hold.) But if not for the sake of truth in opinion, yet for fair-dealing in practice, Dr. Sykes should have interpreted my words not absolutely, but with exceptions. For thus stood the case. He quoted two positions from the *Divine Legation*. 1. That there was an extraordinary Providence over the State in general. 2. Over private men in particular. He grants the first; and denies the second. But is not the extent of that providence understood to be in both cases the same? Now in that over the *State*, he understands it to have been with exceptions, as appears from his own mention of the case of Achan, p. 190; and of David, p. 197. Ought he not then, by all the rules of honest reasoning, to have understood the Proposition denied, in the same sense he understands the Proposition granted? If in the administration over the State in general, there were some few exceptions, why not in That over private men in particular?

But if now the candid reader shall ask me, Why I employed expressions, which, when divorced from the context, might be abused by a Caviller to a perverse meaning, I will tell him. I used them in imitation of the language of the Apostle, who says that, under the Jewish Œconomy, EVERY *transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward.** And if He be to be understood with latitude, why may not I?

P. 5. BB. But as GOD acted with them in the capacity of the Creator and Father of all Men, as well as of tutelary God and King, he was pleased, at the same time, to provide that they should never lose the memory of the attributes of the Almighty: and therefore adds,—*And shewing mercy unto thousands in them that love me and keep my commandments.* Numb. xiv. 18. Deut. v. 9.

P. 5. CC. "The Author of the D. L." (says Dr. Sykes) "goes on, and observes that this punishment [of visiting the iniquities of Fathers upon their Children] *was only to supply the want of a future state.* But how will this *extraordinary œconomy* SUPPLY this want? The Children at present suffer for their Parents' crimes; and are supposed to be punished when they have no guilt. Is not this a plain act of HARDSHIP? And if there be no future state or compensation made, the hardship done must continue for ever a hardship on the unhappy sufferer." [Exam. of Mr. W's account, p. 202, 203.] For a Reasoner, it would be hard to find his fellow. 1. The question is, whether this Law of punishing, was a SUPPLY to the want of a future state? If it laid hold of the passions, as he owns it did, it certainly was a SUPPLY. However, he will prove it was none. And how? Because it was a HARDSHIP. 2. He supposes, I hold, that when Children were *punished*, in the proper sense of the word, they were innocent, whereas I hold, that then they were always guilty. When the innocent were affected by their Parents' crimes, it was by the deprivation

* Heb. ii. 2.

of benefits, in their nature forfeitable. 3. He supposes, that if Moses taught no future state, IT WOULD FOLLOW, that there was none.

P. 5. DD. To this it hath been objected—"As to the proof, that visiting the iniquities of Parents on their Children was designed to supply the want of a future state, because in a *new Dispensation*, it is foretold, that this mode of punishing will be changed; this argument will not be admitted by the Deists, who do not allow that a *new Dispensation* is revealed under the phrase of a *new Covenant*." Here the Objector should have distinguished.—The Deists make two different attacks on Revelation. In the one, They dispute that order, connexion, and dependency between the two Dispensations, as they are delivered in Scripture, and maintained by Believers: In the other, they admit (for argument's sake) this representation of revealed Religion; and pretend to shew its falshood, even upon that footing. Amongst their various arguments in this last method of attack, one is, that the Jewish Religion had no sanction *of a future state*, and so could not come from God. [See Lord Bolingbroke's Posthumous Writings.] The purpose of this work is to turn that circumstance against them: and from the omission of the Doctrine, demonstrate the Divine original of the Law. So that the Reader sees, I am in order, when, to evince a *designed* omission, I explain the Law of punishing the crimes of Fathers on the Children, from the different natures of the two Dispensations; as going upon principles acceded to, though it be only *disputandi gratia*, by the Deists themselves.

P. 6. EE. It hath been objected, "That the Prophet here upbraids the Jews as blameable in the use of this proverb." Without doubt. And their fault evidently consisted in this, That they would insinuate that an *innocent* posterity were punished for the crimes of their forefathers; whereas we have shewn, that when *the children's teeth were set on edge*, they likewise had been tasting.

P. 7. FF. Dr. Stebbing has thought fit to support this charge of contradiction urged by Spinoza and Tyndal, very effectually. He insults the author of the D. L. for pretending to clear up a difficulty, where there was none. "He [the author of the D. L.] has also justified the equity of *another* Law, that of *punishing posterity for the crimes of their forefathers*.—Though it is one of the plainest cases in the world, that God doth this EVERY DAY in the *ordinary* exercise of his Providence." *Hist. of Abr.* p. 89.—MOSES says, *God will visit the iniquity of the Fathers upon the Children*. JEREMIAH and EZEKIEL say as expressly, that *God will not do so*. See, exclaim *Spinoza* and *Tyndal*, the discordancies and contradictions amongst these Prophets. Softly, replies the Author of the *Divine Legation*. You mistake the matter; the contradiction is all a fiction of your own brains: Moses speaks of the *Jewish* Dispensation; and Jeremiah and Ezekiel, of the Christian. I deny that, cries Dr. Stebbing; *punishing posterity for the crimes of their Fathers is done every day under the Christian Dispensation*. And thus the objection of Spinoza and Tyndal, by the kind pains of Dr. Stebbing, remains not only unanswered, but unanswerable. And yet this is the man, whose zeal would not let him rest till he had rescued Revelation from the dishonours brought upon it by the Author of the *Divine Legation*.

P. 8. GG. Yet Doctor Sykes modestly tells his reader, that "there is not any ground or foundation for this distinction; for that the innocent posterity were sometimes deprived of life for the crimes of their Parents in virtue of this Law."—But here, as the Doctor has not to do with me, but with the Prophet, I leave it to be adjusted between them, as the Public

shall think fit to arbitrate.—Another has even ventured to ask, "How the Posterity, if it suffer for its own guilt, can be said to suffer for the transgressions of its Parents?" As this doubt arises from the Prophet's words, *Your iniquity and the iniquities of your fathers together*, &c. I think myself not concerned to satisfy it, till these Writers have more openly rejected the authority of the Prophets.

P. 8. HH. It is observable that by our own Constitution, no forfeitures attend capital condemnations in the Lord High Admiral's and Constable's Courts. And why? the reason is plain; those Judicatures proceed on the Roman, and not on the municipal laws of a feudal Government. Not but that the necessities of state frequently obliged other Governments which never had been feudal, to have recourse to an extemporaneous confiscation. Even Rome itself sometimes exercised the severity of this punishment, even before it fell under the feet of its Tyrants. Cicero, to excuse the confiscations decreed against Lepidus, which affected his children, the nephews of Brutus, says to this latter: "Nec vero me fugit quàm sit acerbum, parentium scelera filiorum pœnis lui. Sed hoc PRÆCLARE LEGIBUS COMPARATUM est, ut caritas liberorum amiciores parentes reipublicæ redderet." Ep. ad Brutum liber, Ep. 12. And again: "In qua videtur illud esse crudele, quod ad liberos, qui nihil meruerunt, pœna pervenit. SED ID ET ANTIQUUM EST, ET OMNIUM CIVITATUM." Ep. 15. Again, the same necessities of State have obliged Governments which had been originally feudal, but were so no longer, to retain this *Law of forfeiture*, essential to feudal Government even after all the feudal tenures had been abolished. But he, who would see the LAW OF FORFEITURES defended on the more general principles of natural justice and civil policy, may have full satisfaction, in the very elegant and masterly Discourse so intitled.

P. 9. II. Here Dr. Sykes, who so charitably takes the *Deists'* part, all the way, against the Author of the D. L. says, "It would have been well TO HAVE TOLD US what this *doctrine* was which was *brought to light*, and which *held up* these daring transgressors, and which *continued* them after death the objects of divine justice." Defence, p. 83. Can the Reader, when he casts his eye upon the text, and sees that *I had told him*, in so many words and letters, that it was a FUTURE STATE, think the grave Doctor in his senses? But this quotation from him will have its use. It will serve for a specimen and example of the miserable dispositions with which an *Answerer by profession* addresses himself to confute Writers who have taken some pains to consider their subject, and to express their meaning.

He goes on objecting to this *unknown* doctrine. He asks "*how this doctrine did these things?*" That is, how the doctrine of a *future state* could extend beyond the present life? This shews at least, he was in earnest in his ignorance, and perfectly well assured that *I had not told him what the doctrine was.*

He proceeds with his interrogations, and asks, *Why the punishing Children for their Fathers' faults had no further use after the bringing in a future state?* I had told him long ago, it was because the punishment was employed only to supply the want of a future state. But to this, he replies,—*nothing hindered its being added to the doctrine of a future state.* It is very true: nor did any thing hinder *temporal rewards* from being added to the doctrine of a future state under the Gospel; yet when a future state was brought to light, by that Dispensation, both one and the other were abolished. But is it not a little strange that the Doctor, in thus insisting on its *further use*, on account of its being able to restrain more daring Spirits, by laying hold of their instincts, at all times, as well under an

unequal as under an *equal* providence, should not see he was arguing against the DIVINE WISDOM, who by the mouth of the Prophet declared it of no further use under the Gospel dispensation?

P. 10. KK. "Ezechielis sententias adeo sententiis Mosis repugnantes invenerunt Rabini, qui nobis illos (qui jam tantum extant) libros Prophetarum reliquerunt, ut fere deliberaverint, ejus librum inter canonicos non admittere, atque eundem plane abscondidissent, nisi quidam Chananias in se suscepisset ipsum explicare, quod tandem magno cum labore et studio (ut ibi narratur) aiunt ipsum fecisse, qua ratione autem non satis constat."—*Spinozæ Tract. Theologico-Pol.* p. 27, 28. In the mean time it may be worth observing, that the explanation which I have here offered, cuts off the only means the modern Jews have of accounting for their long Captivity upon the Principle of the LAW'S being still in force. Limborch urges Orobio with the difficulty of accounting for their present dispersion any other way than for the national crime of rejecting Jesus as the Messiah; seeing they are so far from falling into Pagan idolatries, the crime which brought on their other Captivities, that they are remarkably tenacious of the Mosaic Rites. To which Orobio replies, "that they are not their own sins for which they now suffer, but the sins of their forefathers." Now Ezekiel has declared (and I have reconciled that declaration to the *Law and the Prophets)* that this mode of punishment hath been long abolished.

P. 10. LL. Having thus reconciled the two Prophets, Moses and Ezekiel, on this point, one may be allowed to wonder a little at the want of good faith even in M. Voltaire, when it comes to a certain extreme.

This celebrated Poet has, like an honest man, written in defence of RELIGIOUS TOLERATION: and to inforce his argument has endeavoured (not indeed like a wise one, who should weigh his subject before he undertakes it), to prove, that all Religions in the world, but the Christian, have tolerated diversities of opinion. This common weakness of rounding one's System, for the support of a plain Right which requires no such finishing, hath led him into two of the strangest paradoxes that ever disgraced common sense.

The one, that the *Pagan Emperors* did not persecute the Christian Faith: The other, that the *Jewish Magistrate* did not punish for Idolatry.

In support of the first, his *bad faith* is most conspicuous; in support of the latter, his *bad logic.*

If there be one truth in Antiquity better established than another, it is this, That the Pagan Emperors did persecute the Christians *for their faith only;* established, I say, both by the complaints of the Persecuted, and the acknowledgment of their Persecutors. But this being proved at large in the preface to this very Volume, it is enough to refer the Reader thither.

The other Paradox is much more pleasantly supported. He proves that the Mosaic Law did not denounce punishment on religious errors (though in direct words, it does so), nor did the Jewish Magistrate execute it (though we have several instances of the infliction recorded in their history).—And what is the convincing argument he employs? It is this, *The frequent defections of the Jewish People into Idolatry, in the early times of their apostasies.* An argument hardly so good as this,—*The Church of Rome did not persecute, as appears from that general defection from it, in the sixteenth Century.* I say, Mr. Voltaire's argument is hardly so good as my illustration of it, since the defection from the Church of Rome still continues, and the Jewish defections into Idolatries were soon at an end.

But we are not to think, this Paradox was advanced for nothing, that is,

for the sake of its own singular boldness (a motive generally sufficient to set reason at defiance), nor even for the support of his general question. It was apparently advanced to get the easier at his darling subject, THE ABUSE OF THE MOSAIC RELIGION, that *Marotte* of our party-coloured Philosopher.

Take this instance, which is all that a cursory note will be able to afford.

Mr. Voltaire, speaking of the *rewards* and *punishments* of the Jewish Dispensation, expresses himself in this manner, "Tout etait temporel; et c'est la preuve que le savant Evêque Warburton apporte pour démontrer que la Loi des Juifs était divine; parce que Dieu même étant leur Roi, rendant justice immédiatement apres la transgression ou l'obéissance, n'avoit pas besoin de leur révéler une Doctrine qu'il réservait au tems, où'il ne gouvernerait plus son peuple. Ceux qui par ignorance prétendent que Moyse enseignait l'immortalité de l'ame, ôtent au Nouveau Testament un de ses plus grands avantages sur l'ancien:" * Would not any one now believe (who did not know Mr. Voltaire) that he quoted this argument as what he thought a good one, for the divinity of the Mosaic Religion? Nothing like it. It was only to find occasion to accuse the Old Testament of contradiction. For thus he goes on,—"Cependant malgré l'énoncé précis de cette Loi, malgré cette declaration expresse de Dieu, qu'il punirait jusqu'à la quatriéme génération; *Ezechiel* annonce TOUT LE CONTRAIRE aux Juifs, et leur dit, que le Fils ne portera point l'iniquité de son pere: il va même jusqu'à faire dire à Dieu, qu'il leur avait *donné des preceptes qui n'etaient pas bons.*"†

As for the *precepts which were not good*, the Reader will see that matter explained at large, as we go along. What I have to do with Mr. Voltaire at present, is to expostulate with him for his ill faith; that when he had borrowed my argument for the divinity of the Mosaic Mission from that mode of punishment, he would venture to invalidate it from an apparent contradiction between MOSES and EZEKIEL; when, in that very place of the *Divine Legation* which he refers to, he saw the two Prophets reconciled by an argument drawn from the true natures of two approximating Dispensations; an argument which not only removes the pretended contradiction (first insisted on by *Spinosa*, and, through many a dirty channel, derived, at length, to Mr. Voltaire), but likewise supports that very mark of divinity which I contend for.

But it is too late in the day to call in question the Religion or the good faith of this truly ingenious man. What I want, in this Discourse *sur la Tolérance*, is his CIVIL PRUDENCE. As an ANNALIST, he might, in his *General History*, calumniate the Jewish People just as his passions or his caprice inclined him: But when he had assumed the character of a DIVINE, to recommend *Toleration* to a Christian State, could he think to succeed by abusing *Revelation?* He seems indeed, to have set out under a sense of the necessity of a different conduct: But coming to his darling subject an abuse of the Jews, he could not, for his life, sustain the personage he had assumed, but breaks out again into all the virulence and injustice with which he persecuted this unhappy People in his *General History;* and of which the Reader will see a fair account, in the second volume, b. v. sect. 1.

P. 11. MM. This is the precise character of the writings of the Old Testament. And this state of them (to observe it only by the way) is more than a thousand answers to the wild suspicions of those writers, who fancy that the Jews, since Christ, have corrupted their sacred Scriptures, to support their superstitions against the Gospel; and amongst other erase-

* Page 132. † Page 133.

ments have struck out the Doctrine of life and immortality; which, say these Visionaries, was, till then, as plainly taught in the Old as in the New Testament: For had these supposed Impostors ever ventured on so bold a fraud as the adulterating their sacred Writings, we may be well assured their first attempt would have been to add the doctrine of a future state, had they not found it there, rather than to take it away if they had: since the *omission* of the doctrine is the strongest and most glaring evidence of the *imperfection of the Law;* and the insertion of it would have best supported what they now hold to be one of the most *fundamental* points of their Religion.—But this is not a folly of yesterday. Irenæus tells us that certain ancient Heretics supported their wild fancies against Scripture, which was against them, by the same extravagant suspicion, that it had been interpolated and corrupted. Notwithstanding, I am far from thinking these Moderns borrowed it from them. They found it in our common Nature, which always goes the nearest way to work, to relieve itself.

P. 12. NN. We shall now understand the importance of a remark, which the late Translator of Josephus employs to prove the genuineness of a fragment or homily, given by him to that Historian: "There is one particular observation" (says he) "belonging to the contents of this fragment or homily, that seems to me to be DECRETORY, and to determine the question that some of this Jewish church, that used the Hebrew copy of the Old Testament, nay rather, that Josephus himself in particular was the author of it. The observation is this, that in the present address to the Greeks or Gentiles there are near forty references or allusions to texts of the New Testament; AND NOT ONE, TO ANY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT either in Hebrew or Greek; and this in a discourse concerning HADES; which yet is almost five times as often mentioned in the Old Testament as in the New. What can be the reason of this? But that the Jewish Church at Jerusalem used the Hebrew Bible alone, which those Greeks or Gentiles, to whom the address is here made, could not understand; and that our Josephus always and only used the same Hebrew Bible?" *Mr. Whiston's Dissert.* prefixed to his *Transl. of Josephus*, p. 105.—*What can be the reason* (says he) *of this* mystery? He unfolds it thus: *The Jewish Church of Jerusalem used the Hebrew Bible alone, which those Greeks or Gentiles, to whom the address is here made, could not understand.* So that because the Audience did not understand Hebrew, the Preacher could not quote the texts, he had occasion for, in Greek. But he supposes the Author could not quote the Greek, because it must needs have been that of the *Septuagint;* which the Jewish Church at Jerusalem would not use. Now admit there were no other Greek to be had, or allowed of, Can any man believe that if this Jewish Preacher would turn himself to the Gentiles, he could be such a bigot as to be afraid of quoting the Old Testament in a language they understood, because his Church used only the Original, which they understood not? Or if he had been such a bigot, Would he have dared to preach to the Gentiles at all? What then but the fondness for an hypothesis could make men ramble after such reasons, when so obvious an one lies just before them? Why did he this, do you ask? For this plain reason: His subject was a *future state of reward and punishment*, and he had more sense than to seek for it where it was not to be found. *Oh but* HADES *is almost five times as often mentioned in the Old Testament as in the New.* Indeed! But the fragment is not about the *word*, but the *thing*. In the Old Testament it signified the receptacle of *dead bodies;* in the New, the receptacle of *living souls*. But though this learned writer can, without doubt, laugh at those who seek the *Trinity* in the Old Testament, yet he

can in good earnest go thither in search of a *Future state.* Yet this latter is not in any comparison so clearly hinted at as the other: and no wonder; a Future state is circumscribed to the New Testament, as *brought to light* by the Gospel; but the doctrine of the Trinity is no where said to be so circumscribed.

P. 13. OO. To all this Dr. Stebbing has an *Answer* ready. "The History of the persecution under Antiochus" (says he) "is written by two Historians, namely, the Author of the first book of Maccabees, and the Author of the second. This last writer has recorded the profession of the Martyrs concerning their belief of the doctrine of the Resurrection; but the first has entirely omitted it: nor is there one word about a resurrection or future state to be found throughout his whole History, though it is certain it was now the national belief. *So* UNSAFE *a thing is it to rely upon the* MERE *silence of historians*, when they undertake to write a history *not of doctrines* but of the transactions of men." *Exam.* p. 116.

I will tell him of an unsafer thing: which is, venturing to draw *parallel cases;* as he has done here; for they may happen (as hath happened here) to be *cases most unlike.*

In a large and miscellaneous Volume, composed by various Writers of different times and states, and containing the Law, the Religion, and the History of the Jews, from Moses to the Captivity, neither the Doctrines of the resurrection nor a future state are ever once mentioned.

This is the Fact. And to obviate my inference from it,—"That the Jews, during that period, were unacquainted with the Doctrines," this able Divine opposes the two books of *Maccabees*, containing the story of one short period, when, it is confessed, these Doctrines were of national belief; in the first of which Books, there is no mention of the Doctrine, and in the second, a great deal: the reason both of the mention and of the silence being self-evident. It is recorded in the *second* book, where there is a detailed account of the Martyrs for the Jewish Faith: it is omitted in the *first*, where there is no account of any such thing.

Yet these are brought as *parallel cases:* Let us therefore do them all honour.

1. Several volumes of the sacred Canon contain a *history of doctrines.*

The two books of Maccabees contain only a *history of civil transactions.*

2. None of the inspired Writers of the Canon before the Captivity ever once mentioned the Doctrines of a resurrection or a future state.

Of the two books of Maccabees, one of them mentions the Doctrines fully and at large.

3. The sacred Canon comprises a vast period of time, and treats of an infinite variety of matters.

The two books of Maccabees are small tracts of an uniform subject, and contain only the story of one revolution in the Jewish State.

Unconscious, as should seem, of all this difference, the learned Doctor concludes—*So unsafe a thing it is to rely on the* MERE SILENCE *of Historians, when they undertake to write a history* NOT OF DOCTRINES, *but of the transactions of Men.* In which, these THREE FALSEHOODS are very gravely and magisterially insinuated: That the Writers of the two books of Maccabees are equally *silent* with the Writers of the Canon: 2. That all the Writers of the Canon are writers of a History, *not of the Doctrines*, but merely of the civil transactions of men, equally with the writers of the two Books of Maccabees: And 3. That the thing relied on by me, is the MERE SILENCE of Historians. Which falsehood if the Reader does not see from what has been said above, he may be pleased to consider, that *mere silence* is

when a Writer omits to say a thing which it was indifferent to his purpose whether he said or not. But when he omits to say a thing, which it was much to his purpose to say, this is not a *mere silence*. It is a *silence* attended with a *circumstance*, which makes the evidence drawn from that *silence* something more than negative, and, consequently, something more than *mere silence*. So much for Dr. Stebbing.

A Cornish Writer* pursues the same argument against the *Divine Legation;* but takes his *parallel* much higher. "There is no one" (says he) "who reads HOMER that can doubt whether a Future state were the popular belief amongst the Greeks in the times he writes of. And yet, by what I remember of him, I believe it would be difficult to produce SIX instances in all his poems of any actions either entered upon or avoided from the EXPRESS motive of the rewards or punishments to be expected in the other world."

I inferred from a Future state's NEVER being mentioned in the Jewish History, amongst the motives of men's actions (after it had been omitted in the Jewish Law and Religion), that it was not of popular belief amongst that people. Now here comes an Answerer, and says, that it is not mentioned above SIX TIMES EXPRESSLY in Homer, and yet that nobody *can doubt whether it were not the popular belief amongst the Greeks*. The good cautious man! Had it been but ONCE EXPRESSLY mentioned in the Old Testament, I should no more have doubted of its being of popular belief amongst the Jews, than he does. Why then do we doubt so little, in the case of the Greeks, but for the same reason why we ought to doubt so much in the case of the Jews! HOMER (who gives a detailed account of a future state), this writer allows, has mentioned it about *six times* as a motive. The SCRIPTURES (which, together with the history, deliver the Law and Religion of the Jews, in which a future state is omitted) mention it *not once*, as a motive. But this Answerer would make the reader believe, I made my inference from the *paucity*, and not from the *want*, of the mention. The same may be observed of another expression of this candid Gentleman's—*express motive*. Now much less would have satisfied me; and I should readily have allowed that the Jews had the popular belief amongst them, had the *motive been but once fairly implied*.

But let us take him at the best, and suppose Homer did not afford one single instance. What, I pray you, has HOMER in common with MOSES? Suppose, I should affirm from the Greek History, That the ancient WORTHIES always proportioned their work to their strength and bulk; and that my Answerer was not in an humour to let this pass; but, to confute me, would press me with the high atchievements of TOM THUMB, as they are recorded in his authentic story; who was as famed for his turbulence in king Arthur's Court, as Achilles was in Agamemnon's: Would not this be just as much to the purpose, as to put the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in parallel with the *Law and the Prophets?*

But Homer's poems have been so long called the *Bible of the Pagans*, that this Answerer appears, in good earnest, to have taken them for *religious History;* otherwise how could it have ever entered into his head to make so ridiculous a comparison? My reasoning with regard to SCRIPTURE stood thus.—As all good History deals with the motives of men's actions, so the peculiar business (as it seems to me) of *religious History* is to scrutinize their *religious Motives:* Of these, the principal is the consideration of a Future state. And this not being so much as once mentioned in the ancient Jewish History, it is natural to conclude that the Jews of those

* Mr. Peters.

times had it not. But now, what has Homer's poems to do in this matter? I apprehend they are no *religious History;* but compositions as far removed from it as possible, namely a *military* and *civil* Romance, brimfull of fabulous trumpery. Now in such a work, the writer surely would be principally solicitous about the *civil* motives of his Actors. And Homer, who is confessed to understand what belonged to every kind of Composition, would take care to keep within his subject; and, to preserve decorum, would content himself with supplying his Warriors and Politicians with such motives as might best set off their Wisdom and their Heroism: such as the *love of power*, in which I comprise, revenge on their enemies: the *love of plunder*, in which is included their passion for fair Captives; and the *love of glory*, in which, if you please, you may reckon their regard for their Friends and their Country.—*But in Homer's* military and political Romances *there are hardly six instances in which a future state is mentioned as the express motive;* therefore the perpetual silence on this point, in the *religious History* of the JEWS, and the perpetual mention of it in the *religious Histories* of the SUEVI and the SARACENS, conclude nothing in favour of the argument of the *Divine Legation.*

P. 13. PP. To this Dr. Stebbing objects, that "it means no more than that man was not to be restored to his earthly human state." Exam. p. 60. and, to confirm this, he appeals to the tenth verse of this chapter, which runs thus, *He shall return no more to his house, neither shall his place know him any more.* But the learned Doctor should have reflected, that if Job says the dead man *returns no more to his house*, he gives a reason for his so saying, very inconsistent with the Doctor's interpretation of the 9th verse of the viith chapter. It was, because the dead man was got into *the land of darkness and the shadow of death* [chap. x. 21.] it was because he was *not awake nor could be raised out of his sleep* [chap. xiv. 12.] But the very subject which Job is here treating confutes the Doctor's interpretation: He is complaining that life is short, and that after death *he shall no more see good*, for that he *who goeth down to the grave shall come up no more; he shall return no more to his house* [ver. 7, 8, 9, 10.] which at least *implies* that there was no good to be expected any where, but in this world: And this expectation is cut off in *express terms.*

P. 14. QQ. To this sense of the text, Dr. Stebbing objects, and says, that *by no reward is meant none in this world.* Exam. p. 63, 64. and in support of his interpretation, quotes the words of the verse immediately following—*neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun.* Now I agree with the learned Doctor that these words are an explanation of the foregoing, of the *dead's not having any more a reward:* and from thence draw just the contrary inference, That the sacred writer, from the consideration of the dead's not returning to life to enjoy their reward, concluded that, when once death had seized them, they could have no reward at all; not even that imaginary one, the living in the memory of men, *for the memory of them* (says he) *is forgotten.* So again from the consideration in ver. 6. that the dead *had neither love, hatred, nor envy*, he had concluded ver. 5. that THEY KNEW NOT ANY THING.—But the *premisses* and the *conclusion* not being in their usual order, our learned *Doctor's* Logic did not reach to take the force of the *Preacher's.*

P. 19. RR. To all this, it hath been said,—"Christians have the promise of the life that now is, excepting the case of persecution, Mark x. 30." The words of Jesus in the Evangelist are,—*there is no one that hath* LEFT *house or brethren, &c. for my sake and the Gospel's, but he shall receive an hundred fold now in this time, houses and lands, &c. with persecutions, and in*

the world to come, eternal life. But these words evidently allude to the first Followers of Jesus, while the Church was under an extraordinary Providence, that is, during the Age of Miracles: and as that sort of Dispensation is always aided by the course of natural and civil events, we easily see how it would be promoted by LEAVING a country doomed to the most horrid and exterminating destruction. But St. Paul, where he assigns only *the life which is to come* to the followers of the Gospel, is speaking of a different thing, namely of the genius of the Christian Dispensation in general, as it is opposed to Judaism.

P. 21. SS. The serious reader, who considers all this, will not be a little surprised to hear that eminent Scholar and Divine, Dr. S. Clarke, talk in the following manner, where, after having spoken of the doubts and uncertainties of the ancient Philosophers concerning a future state, he concludes in these words,—"From all which it appears that notwithstanding all the bright arguments and acute conclusions and brave sayings of the best Philosophers, yet *life and immortality* were not FULLY and SATISFACTORILY *brought to light* by BARE NATURAL REASON."—[Ev. of nat. and rev. Religion, p. 146.]—It would be very strange if they had; since Scripture is so far from allowing any part of this discovery to *natural reason*, that it will not admit even the Mosaic Revelation to have a share, but reserves it all for the *Gospel of* CHRIST: so that had natural Religion brought *life and immortality to light*, though not *fully and satisfactorily*, the learned Apostle would be found to have spoken much too highly of the prerogatives of the Gospel.

The truth is, the very learned Writer had two points to make out, in this famous work; the one was the *evidence of natural Religion;* and, under that head, he is to shew, that it taught life and immortality. His other point was, the *evidence of Revealed Religion*, and there, (to shew its use and necessity) he is to demonstrate that bare natural reason could not discover life and immortality. Thus the very method of his demonstration obliged him, in the former part, to give to natural Religion an honour which, in the latter part, he was forced to take away: and to reconcile them with one another, was the purpose of the conciliating words above—*yet life and immortality were not* FULLY *and* SATISFACTORILY *brought to light by bare natural reason:* which indeed does the business; but it is at the expence of the learned Apostle, who says it was not brought to light at all, till the preaching of the Gospel.

P. 21. TT. To this it has been said, "that the *mystery of the Gospel* here mentioned, is rather that which is meant by the word, chap. iii. 3—9. namely the calling in of the Gentiles to be fellow-heirs with the Jews."—For a confutation of this absurd fancy, read—*The free and candid examination of the principles advanced by the Lord Bishop of London*, chap. i. p. 24. et seq. where the learned and most judicious Author has sufficiently exploded it.

THE

DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES

DEMONSTRATED.

BOOK VI.

SECTION I.

After such convincing evidence that a future state did not make part of the Religion of Moses, the reader would not have suspected, he must once more be stopped to hear a long Answer to a set of texts brought from the *Old* and *New* Testament to prove, *That the Doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment* did *make the most essential part of the Mosaic Dispensation:* and this, not by a few fanciful Allegorists, or outrageous Bigots only, who will say, or do any thing; but by many sober men of all Sects and Parties, of all Times, and of all Religions.

I. Several of the ancient Christian Writers were so persuaded of this point, that, not content to say, the doctrine of a Future state made part of the Mosaic Dispensation, they would be confident that the very Pagans learnt it all from thence. Some modern Christians have not been behind them in their *Faith*, but have far outstripped them in their *Charity*, while they treated the denial of this extravagant Opinion as a new species of infidelity. It is true, they are all extremely confused and obscure about the way, they represent it to have been taught: And there have not been wanting, at all times, men of greatest eminence for parts and piety, who have not only doubted, but plainly denied this Future state to be in the Mosaic Religion; though, to be just to all, with the same inconsistency and embarras that the others have maintained it.* However, the more current doctrine hath always been, *That a future state of rewards and punishments was taught by the Law of Moses.*

As surprizing as this may seem to those who have weighed the foregoing Evidence, yet indeed no less could be expected from such a number of concurrent and oddly combined Prejudices, which have served, till now, to discredit one of the clearest and most important truths of Revelation.

* See note A, at the end of this book.

1. The first was, that several Patriarchs and Prophets, both before and under the Mosaic Dispensation, were certainly favoured with the revelation of man's *Redemption;* in which the doctrine of a Future state is eminently contained: And they think it utterly incredible that These should not have conveyed it to their People and Posterity.

2. They could not conceive how a Religion could be worthy of GOD, which did not propose to its Followers a Future State of rewards and punishments; but confined their views to the carnal things of this life only.

3. The truth, here attempted to be established, had been received and *abused* by the Enemies of all true Religion and Godliness; such as the Sadducees of the old Jewish church, the Gnostics of the old Christian, and Unbelievers in all Churches.

4. Lastly, men were kept fast within the error into which these prejudices had drawn them, by never rightly distinguishing between a Future State of reward and punishment, as taught by what men call *natural Religion*, and a future state as taught by *Christian Revelation;* which is the CLUE, as we shall see hereafter, to conduct us through all the errors and perplexities of this *region of darkness*, till we come into the full and glorious *light of the Gospel*.

But in Religious matters, combinations much less strange are sufficient to defeat the credit of the plainest Fact. A noted instance of what OBSTINACY alone can do against the self-evidence of Truth, will abate our wonder at the perversity in question; at least it may be put to use, in the *history of the human mind*, towards which, will be found materials, neither vulgar nor few, in the course of this work. There is a sect, and that no inconsiderable one, which, being essentially founded in Enthusiasm, hath, amongst other of its strange freaks, thrown out the institution of WATER-BAPTISM from its scheme of Christianity. It is very likely that the illiterate Founder, while rapt in his fanatic visions, did not reflect that, of all the institutions of our holy Religion, this of *water-baptism* was least proper to be called in question; being most invincibly established by the practice both of PAUL and PETER. This latter finding that the houshold of Cornelius the GENTILE *had received the Holy Ghost*, regarded it as a certain direction for him to admit them into the Church of Christ, which he did by the initiatory Rite of *water-baptism*. [Acts x. 47.] Paul, in his travels through the Lesser Asia, finding some of the JEWISH Converts who had *never heard of the Holy Ghost*, and, on enquiry, understanding they had been only baptised by water unto *John's Baptism*, thought fit to baptise them with water *in the name of the Lord Jesus*, that is, to admit them into the Church; and then *laying his hands upon them the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied*. [Acts xix. 4, 5, 6.]

In spite of these two memorable transactions, the Quakers have notwithstanding rejected *water-baptism*. What is the pretence? "*Water-baptism*" (it seems) "is John's baptism, and only a type of baptism by the Holy Ghost or by Fire; so that when this last came in use, the former ceased and was abolished." Yet in the two histories given above, both these fancies are reproved; and in such a manner as if the stories had been recorded for no other purpose: For in the adventure of Paul, the *water-baptism of Jesus* is expressly distinguished from the *water-baptism of John:* And, in that of Peter, it appears, that *water-baptism* was necessary for admittance into the church of Christ, even after the ministration of *baptism by fire*, or the communicated power of the Holy Ghost. It is further observable, that these two Heads of the Mission to the two great divisions of Mankind, the JEWS and GENTILES, here acted in one another's province; Peter the Apostle of the Jews administering baptism to the Gentile houshold of Cornelius; and Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles administering the same rite to the Jewish Converts. And why was this crossing of hands but to obviate that silly evasion, that *water-baptism* was only partial or temporary?

But what is reason, evidence, or truth, when opposed to religious Prejudice! The Quakers do not hold it to be clearer, that *repentance from dead works* is necessary for obtaining the spiritual benefits of the Gospel-Covenant, than that WATER-BAPTISM is abolished, and of no use to initiate into the Church of Christ.

II. But to proceed. The error in question is, as we said, not confined to the Christian Church. The Jews too maintain it with equal obstinacy, but not with equal indiscretion; *the Children of this world are, in their generation, wiser than the Children of light;* * their fatal adherence to their long abolished Rites depending altogether upon this single prejudice, that Moses taught a future state of rewards and punishments: for if he taught it not, the consequence is inevitable, his Religion could be only *preparatory* to one that did teach it. This therefore is their great support; and wisely have they inforced it by all the authority and power of the Synagogue.† But what Christians gain by so doing, I confess I know not. What they lose hath been seen in part, and will be more fully shewn hereafter: not one demonstration only, of the truth of the Mosaic Mission, but all true conception of that divine harmony which inspires every part, and runs through the whole of GOD's great Dispensation to Mankind.

III. The error is still more extensive; and hath spread from true Religion to the false; a fitter soil for its reception. For the MAHOMETANS, who hold the divine original of the Jewish Law, are as obstinate as the best, in giving it this mistaken advantage: but, it must be

* Luke xvi. 8. † See the Dedication prefixed to book iv.

owned, under a modester pretext. Their expedient for saving the honour of the Law is this: They confess the Doctrine of a future state is not at present to be found there: BUT THOUGH IT BE NOT THERE, IT OUGHT TO BE; for that the Jews, in pure spite to them, have interpolated their Bible, and taken away all mention of it.*

Matters being in this odd situation, the reader will excuse me, if I turn a little to consider those texts of Scripture which CHRISTIAN writers have produced to prove, *That a future state of rewards and punishments does indeed make part of the Mosaic Religion.*

II.

But here let me observe, that the thing of most consequence in this part of my discourse will be to state the question clearly and plainly. When that is done, every common reader will be able, without my help, to remove the objections to my System; or rather, the question being thus truly stated, they will fall of themselves.

I. My declared purpose, in this Work,† is to demonstrate *The Divine Legation of* MOSES, in order to use it for the foundation of a projected defence of Revelation in general, as the Dispensation is compleated in Christianity. The medium I employ for this purpose is, that there was *no future state of reward and punishment in the Mosaic Religion.* I must needs therefore go upon these two principles: 1. That *Moses did not disbelieve a future state of reward and punishment.* 2. That *his Religion was preparatory to the Religion of* JESUS *which taught such future state.* Hence proceed these consequences:

1. From my holding that *Moses did not disbelieve a future state,* it follows, that all those texts of Scripture which are brought to prove that *the ancient Jews believed the soul survived the body,* are nothing to the purpose: but do, on the contrary, greatly confirm my Thesis: for which reason I have myself shewn that the early Jews did indeed suppose this truth.

2. From my holding that *the Religion of Moses was only preparatory to the Religion of* JESUS, it follows, that all such texts, as imply a *Future state of rewards and punishments in their* TYPICAL *signification* only, are just as little to the purpose. For if Moses's Religion was preparatory to one Future, it is, as I have shewn,‡ highly reasonable to suppose, that the essential doctrine of that New Religion was shadowed out under the Rites, or by the inspired penmen, of the Old.

* "*Taourat*—Les Musulmans disent, que c'est l'ancien Testament que Dieu revela à Moyse écrit en langue Hebraïque, livre qui a été alteré et corrumpu par les Juifs.—C'est la le sentiment des Musulmans qui a été recueilli de plusieurs auteurs Arabes par *Hagi Khalfah.* Le même auteur dit—que l'on n'y trouve pas aussi aucun endroit où il soit parlé de l'autre vie, ni de la Resurrection, ni du Paradis, ni de l'Enfer, et que cela vient peut être de ce que les Juifs ont corrompu leurs exemplaires."—Voyez *la Bibliotheque Orientale de M. D'Herbelot,* Mot. TAOUART. † See the Appendix to the first edition of "the Alliance between Church and State." ‡ See the last section of this book.

But such texts are not only inconclusive, but highly corroborative of the opinion they are brought to oppose. For if future rewards and punishments were taught to the People under the law, what occasion was there for any *typical* representation of them, which necessarily implies the throwing things into shade, and secreting them from vulgar knowledge? What ground was there for that distinction between a *carnal* and a *spiritual* meaning (both of which it is agreed the Mosaic Law had, in order to fit it for the use of two Dispensations) if it did not imply an ignorance of the spiritual sense during the continuance of the first? Yet as clear as this is, the contrary is the doctrine of my Adversaries; who seem to think that the *spiritual* and the *carnal* sense must needs always go together, like the jewel and the foil in Aaron's breast-plate.

Both these sorts of texts, therefore, conclude only against SADDUCEES and INFIDELS. Yet hath this matter been so little attended to, in the judgements passed upon my argument, that both sorts have been urged as confutations of it. I speak not here of the dirty calumnies of one or two forgotten scriblers, but of the unequitable censures of some who better deserve to be set right.

II. But farther, As my position is, *that a future state of reward and punishment was not taught in the Mosaic Dispensation*, all texts brought to prove the knowledge of it *after* the time of David are as impertinent as the rest. For what was known from this time, could not supply the want of what was unknown for so many ages before. This therefore puts all the prophetic Writings out of the question.

And now, when all these Texts are taken from my Adversaries, what is there left, to keep up the quarrel? Should I be so severe to insist on the common rights of Authors, of not being obliged to answer to convict impertinencies, this part of my task would be soon over. But I shall, in charity, consider these Texts, such as they are. However, that I may not appear altogether so absurd as the Inforcers of them, I shall give the reader my reasons for this condescension.

1. As to the FUTURE EXISTENCE OF THE SOUL, we should distinguish between the mention of it by Moses, and by the following Writers. These might, and, as we have shewn, did conclude for its existence from the nature of the thing. But Moses, who, we suppose, intentionally omitted the mention of *Future rewards and punishments*, would not, we must needs suppose likewise, proclaim the preparatory doctrine of the *Existence*. Nor could he, on the other hand, deny what he knew to be the truth. Thus, being necessitated to speak of Enoch's *Translation*, it could not be, but that a *separate existence* might be inferred, how obscurely soever the story was delivered. But had he said any thing, in his account of the Creation, which literally implied (as the words, of man's being *made in the image of God*, and the *breath of life* being breathed into his nostrils,

are supposed to do) that man had an immortal soul, then must Moses be supposed, purposely, to have inculcated that Immortality; contrary to what we hold, that he purposely omitted the doctrine built upon it, namely, a future state of reward and punishment. It will not be improper therefore to shew that such texts have not this pretended meaning.

2. Concerning a FUTURE STATE OF REWARD AND PUNISHMENT; several texts are brought as teaching it in a *typical sense*, which teach it in *no sense* at all: several as teaching it in a direct and *literal* sense, which only teach it in a *typical*. Both these, therefore, it may be proper to set in a true light.

3. Lastly, concerning the texts from the *later Prophets*, which are *without* the period in question; I own, and it is even incumbent on my Argument to prove, that these Prophets opened the first dawning of the doctrine of a *Resurrection*, and consequently of a *Future state of reward and punishment*: even these therefore shall in their proper place be carefully considered. At present let me just observe, that the dark veil under which the *first set* of Prophets delivered their *typical* representations was gradually drawn aside by the *later*.

SECTION II.

HAVING premised thus much to clear the way, and shorten the inquiry, I now proceed to my examination.

And first, of the *texts* brought from the OLD TESTAMENT.

Now as the book of JOB * is supposed to teach both a SEPARATE EXISTENCE and a FUTURE STATE OF REWARD AND PUNISHMENT; and is besides thought by some to be the first of Moses's writings; and by others to be written even before his time, and by the Patriarch himself, I shall give it the precedence in this inquiry: which it deserves likewise on another account, the superior evidence it bears to the point in question; if indeed it bear any evidence at all. For it may be said by those who thus hold it to be the earliest Scripture (allowing the words of *Job, I know that my Redeemer liveth*, &c. to respect a future state) that the Jewish people must not only have had the knowledge of a FUTURE STATE *of rewards and punishments*, but, what is more, of the RESURRECTION *of the body*, and still more, of the REDEMPTION *of mankind by the Son of God*: therefore Moses had no need to inculcate the doctrine of a future state.† But I much suspect that the clear knowledge of so sublime a mystery, which, St. Paul says, *had been hid from ages, and from generations, but was now* (on the preaching of the Gospel) *made manifest to the saints*,‡ was not at all suited to the times of Job or Moses. The learned and

* See note B, at the end of this book.
† See note C, at the end of this book.
‡ Col. i. 26.

impartial Divine will perhaps be rather inclined to think, that either the book of Job was written in a much later age, or that this famous passage has a very different meaning. I shall endeavour to shew, that neither of these suspicions would be entertained without reason.

I.

First then concerning the book itself.

As to the Person of *Job*, the eminence of his Character, his fortitude and patience in afflictions, and his preceding and subsequent felicity; these are realities so unquestionable, that a man must have set aside sacred Antiquity before he can admit a doubt concerning them. But that the book which bears Job's name was written by him, or in any age near his own, a careful and capable examiner will, I persuade myself, be hardly brought to believe.

In the order of this discourse therefore I shall inquire,

I. What kind of Composition the book of Job really is.

II. In what Age it was written. And,

III. Who was its Author.

I.

Even those who are inclined to suppose this a Work of the highest Antiquity, and to believe it an exact history of Job's sufferings and patience, and of GOD's extraordinary dispensations towards him, recorded by his own hand, are yet forced to confess that the Introduction and Conclusion are of another nature, and added by a later hand, to give that fulness and integrity to the Piece, which works of imagination, and only such works, require. This is a large concession, and plainly intimates that he who wrote the *Prologue* and *Epilogue*, either himself believed the body of the work to be a kind of *dramatic* Composition; or, at least, intended that others should have that opinion of it. I shall therefore the less scruple to espouse the notion of those who conclude the WHOLE TO BE DRAMATICAL. For the transferring the *Prologue* and *Epilogue* to a late writer was only an expedient to get rid of a circumstance which shewed it to be such a sort of work; and which consequently might bring it down to an age remote from that of the subject. But those who contrived this expedient seem to have had but a slender idea of the ancient *Drama*, which was generally rounded with a *Prologue* and *Epilogue* of this sort; to give, by way of narrative, information of such facts as fell not within the compass of the one entire Action represented.*

I am induced to embrace this opinion from the cast of the STYLE, the SENTIMENTS, and COMPOSITION; all perfectly suited to such a kind of Work, and ill agreeing with any other.

1. As to the *Style*, it hath been observed by the Critics, even from

* See note D, at the end of this book.

the time of Jerom, that all but the introduction and conclusion is in measure. But as it was the custom of Antiquity to write their gravest works of Religion, Law, and History, in verse; this circumstance alone should, I think, have little share in determining the nature of the Composition. And as little, I think, on the other hand, ought the frequent use of the Arabic dialect to be insisted on, in support of its high original, since, if it be of the *nature*, and of the *date*, here supposed, an able writer would chuse to give his Fable that air of Antiquity and verisimilitude.

2. But when we take the *Sentiments* along, and find throughout the whole, not only verse but poetry, a poetry animated by all the sublimity of figures and luxuriance of description; and this, on the coolest and most abstracted subject; we cannot chuse but conclude it to be a work of imagination. Nor is it sufficient to say, that this is owing to an Eastern genius, whose kindling fancy heats all his thoughts into a glow of expression: for if the two ends be his who wrote the middle, as we have no reason to doubt, they shew him not unused to the plainest form of narration. And as to that Eastern genius itself, though distinguishingly sublime when a poetic subject has enflamed its enthusiasm, yet in mere history, nothing can be more cool and simple; as all acquainted either with their ancient or modern writers can inform us. But, what is more to our purpose, the sacred Prophets themselves, though wrapt in ecstasy of the divine impressions, when treating of the question here debated, namely, *Whether and wherefore the Good are frequently unhappy and the Bad prosperous*, a question that came sometimes in their way, while they were reproving their impious and impatient countrymen, who by their repeated apostasies had now provoked GOD to withdraw from them, by degrees, his extraordinary providence; when, I say, they touch upon this question, they treat the matter with the utmost plainness and simplicity.

3. But the last and most convincing circumstance is the *form* of the composition. And here I shall not urge, as of much weight, what hath been observed by some who take this side of the question, the scenical image of Job and his friends sitting together on the ground seven days and seven nights without a word speaking.* Because we reasonably suppose no more to be meant than that excess of mutual grief making them unfit to give, and him to receive consolation, they were some days † before they entered on the subject of their visit.

This rather is the thing to be admired, (if we suppose it all historic truth) that three cordial friends should make a solemn appointment

* Job ii. 13. † "Eo quod Hebræi soleant multiplicare per *septem* (h. e. septenarium numerum pro multitudine ponere)."—MAIMON. *More Nevochim*, p. 267.

to go *mourn with Job and to comfort him;* * that they should be so greatly affected with his extreme distresses, as to be unable to utter a word for *seven* whole *days* together; and yet, after this, to be no sooner set in, than intirely to forget their errand, and *(miserable comforters as they were)* instead of mourning with him in the bitterness of his soul, to wrangle, and contradict him in every word he spoke; and this without the least softening of Friendship; but with all the fierceness and acrimony of angry Disputants contending for a victory. It was no trifle neither that they insisted on, in which indeed disputatious men are often the warmest, but a contradiction in the tenderest point. They would needs have it, against all Job's protestations to the contrary, that his misfortunes came upon him in punishment for his crimes. Suppose their Friend had been wrong in the judgement he passed on things, Was this a time to animadvert in so pitiless a manner on his errors? Would not a small share of affection, pity, or even common humanity, have disposed them to bear one *seven days* longer with their old distressed Acquaintance? Human nature is ever uniform; and the greater passions, such as those of friendship and natural affection, shew themselves to be the same at all times: But we have an instance in these very times, in that amiable domestic story of Joseph. This Patriarch had been cruelly injured by his brethren. Providence at length put them into his power; and, in just resentment of their inhuman usage, he thought fit to mortify and humble them: but no sooner did he find them begin to be unhappy, than his anger subsided, violated affection returned, and he melted into their bosoms with all the tenderness of a fellow-sufferer. This was Nature: This was History. And shall we suppose the feelings of true Friendship to be inferior to those of Family-affection? David thought otherwise, where, speaking of Jonathan, he declares their mutual love was wonderful, surpassing that of the strongest natural affection, the passion between the two sexes. The same have always been the Friendships of good men, when founded on virtue, and strengthened by a similitude of manners.

So that it appears, these three friends were of a singular complexion; and deservedly gave occasion to a proverb which sets them in no very honourable or advantageous light.

But suppose now the work to be *dramatical,* and we immediately see the reason of their behaviour. For had they not been indulged in their strange captious humour, the Author could never have produced a piece of that integrity of action, which a scenic representation demanded: and they might as well have held their tongues *seven days* longer, as not contradict, when they did begin to speak.†

This, as to what the *Drama* in general required. But had this

* Job ii. 11. † See note E, at the end of this book.

been all we could say for their conduct, we should needs confess that the divine Writer had here done, what mere mortal Poets so frequently do; that is, had transgressed nature (in such a representation of friendship) for the sake of his Plot. But we shall shew, when we come to examine the MORAL of the poem, that nature is exactly followed; for that under these three *miserable Comforters*, how true friends soever in the *Fable*, certain false friends were intended to be shadowed out in the *Moral*.*

But now the dispute is begun and carried on with great vehemence on both sides. They affirm, they object, they answer, they reply; till, having exhausted their whole stock of arguments, and made the matter more doubtful than they found it, the Author, in this embarras, has recourse to the common expedient of dramatic writers, to draw him from his straits,—Θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς. And if ever that precept of the masters of composition,

Nec Deus intersit, nisi dignus Vindice nodus,

was well followed, it was here. For what can we conceive more worthy the presence of a GOD than to interfere with his Authority, to silence those frivolous or impious disputes amongst men concerning the MYSTERIOUS WAYS OF PROVIDENCE? And that this interposition was nothing more, I think, is evident from hence: The subject, as we observe, was of the highest importance, namely, *Whether, and why, good men are unhappy, and the evil prosperous?* The disputants had much perplexed the question by various answers and replies; in which each side had appealed to reason and experience; so that there wanted a superior Wisdom to moderate and determine. But, to the surprise of all who consider this attentively, and consider it as a strict History, they find GOD introduced to do this in a speech which clears up no difficulties; but makes all hopes of deciding the question desperate, by an appeal to his Almighty power.† A plain proof that the Interposition was no more than a piece of poetical Machinery. And in that case we see the reason why the knot remains untied: for the sacred Writer was no wiser ‡ when he spoke poetically in the Person of God, than when he spoke in the person of Job or his friends.

On these accounts, and on many more, which will be touched upon in the course of this dissertation, but are here omitted to avoid repetition, I conclude, that those Critics who suppose the book of Job to be of the *dramatic* kind do not judge amiss.

Nor does such idea of this truly divine Composition at all detract from the proofs we have of the real existence of this holy Patriarch, or of the truth of his exemplary Story. On the contrary, it much

* See note F, at the end of this book.
† See note G, at the end of this book.
‡ See note H, at the end of this book.

confirms them: seeing it was the general practice of dramatic Writers, of the serious kind, to chuse an illustrious Character or celebrated Adventure for the subject of the Piece, in order to give their poem its due dignity and weight. And yet, which is very surprising, the Writers on both sides, as well those who suppose the Book of Job to be dramatical, as those who hold it to be historical, have fallen into this paralogism, *That, if dramatical, then the Person and History of Job are fictitious.* Which nothing but inattention to the nature of a dramatic Work, and to the practice of dramatic Writers, could have occasioned. Lactantius had a much better idea of this species of composition: "Totum autem, quod referas, fingere, id est, inceptum esse, et Mendacem potius quam Poetam."

But this fallacy is not of late standing. Maimonides, where he speaks of those whose opinion he seems to incline to, that say the book of *Job* is parabolical, expresses himself in this manner.* *You know, there are certain men who say, that such a man as* JOB *never existed. And that his* HISTORY *is nothing else but a parable.* These *certain men* were (we know) the Talmudists. Now, as, by *his History*, he means this book of Job, it is evident he supposed the fabulosity of the book concluded against the existence of the Patriarch. Nay, so insensibly does this inveterate fallacy insinuate itself into our reasonings on this subject, that even GROTIUS himself appears not to be quite free from the entanglement. Who, although he saw these two things, (a real Job and a dramatic representation of him) so reconcileable, that he supposed both; yet will not allow the *book* of Job to be later than Ezekiel, because that Prophet mentions Job.† Which argument, to have any strength, must suppose Job to be unknown until this Book was written; consequently that his Person was fictitious; contrary to his own supposition, that there was a real Job living in the time of Moses.‡ After this, it is no wonder, that the Author of the *Archæologiæ Philosophicæ*, whose talent was not critical acumen, should have reasoned so grosly on the same fallacious principle.§ These learned men, we see, would infer a visionary Job from a visionary History. Nor is the mistake of another celebrated Writer less gross, who would, on the contrary, infer a real history from a real Job. *Ezekiel and St. James* (says Dr. Middleton, in his essay on the Creation and Fall of Man) *refer to the* BOOK OF JOB *in the same manner as if it were a real history.* Whereas the truth is, they do not refer to the BOOK OF JOB at all.

II. The second question to be considered, is in what Age this book was composed.

* *Nósti quosdam esse, qui dicunt Jobum nunquam fuisse, neque creatum esse; sed* HISTORIAM *illius nihil aliud esse quàm Parabolam.* † Ezek. xiv. 14. ‡ Vid. GROTII *Præf. in Librum Job.* § See note I, at the end of this book.

1. First then we say in general, that it was written some time under the Mosaic Dispensation. But to this it is objected, that, if it were composed in those Times, it is very strange that not a single word of the Mosaic Law, nor any distant allusion to the Rites or Ceremonies of it, nor any historical circumstance under it, nor any species of idolatry in use during its period, should be found in it.*

I apprehend the objection rests on one or other of these suppositions, Either that the book is not a Work of the dramatic kind; or that the Hero of the Piece is fictitious. But both these suppositions have been shewn to be erroneous; so that the objection falls with them. For to observe DECORUM is one of the most essential rules of *dramatic* writing. He therefore who takes a real Personage for the subject of his poem will be obliged to shew him in the customs and sentiments of his proper Age and Country; unmixed with the manners of the Writer's later Time and Place. Nature and the reason of the thing so evidently demand this conduct, and the neglect of it has so ungracious an effect, that the polite Roman Historian thought the Greek tragic Writers were to blame even for mentioning the more modern name of Thessaly, in their pieces of the Trojan War. And he gives this good reason for his censure, *Nihil enim ex Persona Poëtæ, sed omnia sub eorum, qui illo tempore vixerunt, dixerunt.*†

But to lay no greater stress on this argument than it will bear; I confess ingenuously, that were there not (as the objection supposes) the least distant relation or allusion to the Jewish Law or History throughout the whole book, it might reasonably create some suspicion that the Author lived before those times. For though this rule of *decorum* be so essential to *dramatic* writing, yet, as the greatest Masters in that art frequently betrayed their own Times and Country in their fictitious Works,‡ we can hardly suppose a Jewish Writer more exact in what only concerned the critical perfection of his Piece. But as DECORUM is one of the plainest and simplest principles of Composition, we cannot suppose a good writer ignorant of it; and so are not to look for such glaring absurdities as are to be found in the dramatic writings of late barbarous ages; but such only as might easily escape the most exact and best instructed Writer.

Some slight *indecorums* therefore we may reasonably expect to find, if the Author were indeed a Jew: and such, if I am not much mis-

* "Jobus Arabs πολυκλειτὸς καὶ πολυμαθὴς, in cujus historiâ multa occurrunt antiquæ sapientiæ vestigia, antiquior habetur Mose. Idque multis patet indiciis: Primo, quòd nullibi meminerit rerum à Mose gestarum, sive in Ægypto, sive in exitu, sive in deserto.—Secundo, quòd, cùm vir pius et veri numinis cultor fuerit, legi Mosaicæ contraiverit, in sacrificiis faciendis.—Tertio, ex ætatis et vitæ suæ mensura, in tertio, plus minus, à Diluvio sæculo collocandus esse videtur: vixit enim ultra ducentos annos.—Cùm de Idololatria loquitur, memorat primum ipsius genus Solis et Lunæ adorationem.—Neque Sabbathi neque ullius legis factitiæ meminit.—His omnibus adducor ut credam, Mosi Jobum tempore anteisse."—*Archæol. Philos.* pp. 265, 266. † See note K, at the end of this book. ‡ See note L, at the end of this book.

taken, we shall find. Job speaking of the wicked man, says: *He that speaketh flattery to his friends, even the eyes of his children shall fail**—GOD *layeth up iniquity for his children.*† And in the course of the dispute, and in the heat of altercation, this peculiar dispensation is touched upon yet more precisely. Job, in support of his doctrine, paints at large the happy condition of prosperous wicked men; a principal circumstance of whose felicity is, *that they spend their days in wealth, and in a moment go down to the grave,*‡ i. e. without sickness, or the terrors of slow-approaching death. The lot which prosperous libertines of all times, who believe no future reckoning, most ardently wish for. Now in the declining times of the Jewish Œconomy, pious men had always their answer ready. The prosperous wicked man (say they) shall be punished in his Posterity, and the afflicted good man rewarded in them. To the first part of the solution concerning the wicked, Job answers thus, *God layeth up his iniquity for his children; he rewardeth him, and he shall know it.*§ As much as to say, the evil man sees and knows nothing of the punishment; in the mean time, he feels and enjoys his own felicity, as a reward. To the second part, concerning the good, he answers thus, *His eyes shall see his destruction, and he shall drink of the wrath of the Almighty: For what pleasure hath he in his house after him, when the number of his months is cut off in the midst?*‖ i. e. The virtuous man sees and feels nothing but his own miseries; for what pleasure can the good things reserved for his posterity afford to him who is to taste and enjoy none of it; being not only extinct long before, but cut off untimely?

In another place, Job says, *That idolatry was an iniquity to be punished by the judge.*¶ Now both this and the former species of punishment were, as we have shewn, peculiar to the Mosaic Dispensation. But a Jew might naturally mistake them for a part of the general Law of God and nature: and so, while he was really describing the Œconomy under which he lived, suppose himself to be representing the notions of more ancient times: which that it was his design to do, in the last instance at least, appears from his mentioning only the most early species of idolatry, the worship of the *Sun* and *Moon.*** Again, the language of Job with regard to a *future state* is the very same with the Jewish Writers. *He that goeth down to the grave* (says this writer) *shall come up no more:—they shall not awake or be raised out of their sleep.* Thus the Psalmist,—*In death there is no remembrance of thee.—Shall the dead* ARISE *and praise thee!*—And thus the author of Ecclesiastes,—*The dead know not any*

* Job xvii. 5. † Job xxi. 19. And see note M, at the end of this book.
‡ Job xxi. 13. § Verse 19. ‖ Verses 20, 21. ¶ Job xxxi. 28. And see note N, at the end of this book. ** Verse 26.

thing, neither have they any more a REWARD.* And we know what it was that hindered the Jews from entertaining any expectations of a future state of rewards and punishments, which was a popular doctrine amongst all their Pagan neighbours.

But there is, besides this of *Customs* and *Opinions*, another circumstance that will always betray a feigned Composition, made in an age remote from the subject: and that is, the use of later *phrases*. These are more easily discovered in the modern, and even in what we call the learned languages: but less certainly, in the very ancient ones; especially in the Hebrew, of which there is only one, and that no very large Volume, remaining. And yet even here, we may detect an author of a later age. For, besides the phrases of common growth, there are others, in every language, interwoven alike into the current style, which owe their rise to some singular circumstance of time and place; and so may be easily traced up to their original: though, being long used in common speech in a general acceptation, they may well escape even an attentive Writer. Thus Zophar, speaking of the wicked man, says: *He shall not see the rivers, the floods, the* BROOKS OF HONEY AND BUTTER.† This in ordinary speech only conveyed the idea of *plenty* in the abstract; but seems to have been first made a proverbial saying from the descriptions of the holy Land.‡ Again, Eliphaz says, *Receive, I pray thee,* THE LAW FROM HIS MOUTH, *and lay up his words in thine heart.*§ That is, *be obedient:* but the phrase was taken from the verbal delivery of the Jewish Law from Mount Sinai. The Rabbins were so sensible of the expressive peculiarity of this phrase, that they say the LAW OF MOSES is here spoken of by a kind of prophetic anticipation. Again, Job cries out: *O that I were—as I was in the days of my youth, when the* SECRET OF GOD WAS UPON MY TABERNACLE,‖ that is, *in full security:* Evidently taken from the residence of the Divine Presence or SHEKINAH, in a visible form, on the ark, or on the tent where the ark was placed. And again—*O that one would hear me! Behold my desire is that the Almighty would answer me, and that mine Adversary had written a book. Surely I would take it upon my shoulder and bind it as a* CROWN *to me.*¶ A phrase apparently taken from the use of their PHYLACTERIES; which at least were as ancient as their return from Captivity, and coeval with their scrupulous adherence to the Law.

A third circumstance, which will betray one of these feigned compositions, is the Author's being drawn, by the vigour of his imagination, from the seat of Action and from the manners of the

* See the preceding book, p. 14. † Job xx. 17. ‡ See Exod. iii. 8; xiii. 5; xxxiii. 3; Deut. xxxi. 20; 2 Kings xviii. 32. § Job xxii. 22. ‖ Job xxix. 4. ¶ Job xxxi. 35, 36.

Scene, to one very different; especially, if it be one of great fame and celebrity. So here, though the Scene be the deserts of Arabia, amongst family-heads of independent Tribes, and in the simplicity of primitive Manners, yet we are carried by a poetic fancy, into the midst of EGYPT, the best policied, and the most magnificent Empire then existing in the world.—*Why died I not from the womb* (says the chief Speaker) *for now I should have lien still and been quiet, I should have slept; then had I been at rest; with* KINGS *and* COUNSELLORS OF THE EARTH, *which build* DESOLATE PLACES *for themselves;* * i. e. magnificent buildings, in desolate places, meaning plainly the PYRAMIDS raised in the midst of barren sands, for the burying places of the kings of Egypt—*Kings and counsellors of the earth*—was, by way of eminence, the designation of the Egyptian Governors. So Isaiah—*the counsel of the wise counsellors of Pharaoh is become brutish. How say ye unto Pharaoh, I am the son of the wise, the son of ancient kings.*† But it may be observed in general, that though the Scene confined the Author to scattered Tribes in the midst of Deserts, yet his images and his ideas are, by an insensible allure, taken throughout, from crouded Cities and a civil policied People. Thus he speaks of the Children of the wicked *being crushed in the gate,*‡ alluding to a City taken by storm, and to the destruction of the flying inhabitants pressing one another to death in the narrow passage of the City-gates.—Again, of the good man it is said, that *he shall be hid from the scourge of tongues;* § that pestilent mischief which rages chiefly in rich and licentious Communities. But there would be no end of giving instances of this kind, where they are so numerous.

Hitherto the Author seems unwarily to have betrayed his Times and Country. But we shall now see that he has made numerous allusions to the miraculous History of his Ancestors with serious *purpose and design.* For this poem being written, as will appear, for the comfort and solace of his Countrymen, he reasonably supposed it would advance his principal end, to refresh their memories with some of the more signal deliverances of their Forefathers. In the mean time, *decorum,* of which we find him a careful observer, required him to preserve the image of very different and distant times. This was a difficulty: and would have been so to the ablest Writer. Both these were matters of importance; and neither one nor the other could be omitted, without neglecting his Purpose, or deforming his Composition. How then can we conceive a skilful Artist would act if not in this manner; he would touch those stories, but with so slight

* Job iii. 11, 13, 14. † Isai. xix. 11. ‡ Job v. 4. The Septuagint renders it very expressively κολαφρισθείησαν ἐπὶ θύραις ἡσσόνων. § See note O, at the end of this book.

an outline and such airy colouring, as to make them pass unheeded by a careless observer; yet be visible enough to those who studied the Work with care and attention. Now this artful temper our divine Writer, we say, hath observed. The conduct was fine and noble: and the cloud in which he was forced to wrap his studied allusions, will be so far from bringing them into question, that it will confirm their meaning; as it now appears, that if an able Writer would, in such a work, make allusions to his own Times, Religion, and People, it must be done in this covert manner. Thus Job, speaking of the Omnipotence of GOD,—*which commandeth the sun, and it riseth not, and sealeth up the stars,** plainly enough alludes to the miraculous history of the people of GOD, in the Egyptian Darkness, and the stopping of the Sun's course by Joshua. This appeared so evident to a very learned Commentator, though in the other opinion of the book's being of Job's own writing, that he was forced to suppose that his author spoke proleptically, as knowing by the gift of Prophesy, what GOD in a future age would do.† So where Job says, *God divideth the sea with his power, and by his understanding he smiteth through the proud,*‡ he evidently refers to the destruction of *Pharaoh and his host in the Red-sea.* Again, in the following words, *He taketh away the heart of the chief of the people of the earth, and causeth them to wander in a wilderness where there is no way,*§ who can doubt but that they allude to the wandering of the Israelites forty years in the wilderness, as a punishment for their cowardice, and diffidence in GOD's promises; Eliphaz, speaking of the wonderful works of GOD, declares how he came to the knowledge of them, *I will shew thee; hear me; and what I have seen I will declare; which wise men have told from their fathers, and have not hid it:* ‖ the very way in which Moses directs the Israelites to preserve the memory of the miraculous works of GOD. And who are these *wise men?* They are so particularly marked out as not to be mistaken: *Unto whom alone the earth was given, and* NO STRANGER PASSED AMONGST THEM.¶ A circumstance agreeing to no People whatsoever but to the Israelites settled in Canaan. The same Eliphaz, telling Job to his face, that his misfortunes came in punishment for his Crimes, says: *Thou hast taken a pledge from thy brother for nought, and stripped the naked of his cloathing.*** And Job, speaking of the most profligate of men, describes them, amongst other marks of their iniquity, by this, that *they caused the naked to lodge without cloathing, that they have no covering in the cold;* †† that *they take a pledge*

* Job ix. 7. † "Hoc videtur respicere historiam Josuæ vel Ezechiæ, quanquam ante illos Job extiterit. Sed hæc potuerunt per anticipationem dici, quod Jobum non lateret penes Deum esse id efficere quandocunque luberet."—CODURCUS *in locum.*
‡ Job xxvi. 12. § Job xii. 24. ‖ Job xv. 17, 18. ¶ Verse 19.
** Job xxii. 6. †† Job xxiv. 7.

*of the poor, and cause him to go naked without cloathing.** Who that sees this ranked amongst the greatest enormities, but will reflect that it must have been written by one well studied in the LAW OF MOSES, which says: *If thou at all take thy neighbour's raiment to pledge, thou shalt deliver it unto him by that the sun goeth down; for that is his covering only, it is his raiment for his skin: Wherein shall he sleep? And it shall come to pass, when he crieth unto me, that I will hear, for I am gracious.* Which Law, as the learned Spencer observes, was *peculiar* to this institution.† Elihu, speaking of GOD's dealing with his servants, says: "That he may *withdraw man from his purpose*, and hide *pride* from man, he keepeth back his soul *from the pit*, and his life from *perishing by the sword*. He is chastened also with pain upon his *bed*, and the multitude of his bones with strong pain. His soul draweth *nigh unto the grave*, and his life to the destroyers. If there be a *messenger* with him, an *interpreter, one amongst a thousand to shew unto man his uprightness*, then he is *gracious* unto him, and saith, *Deliver him from going down to the pit, I have found a ransom.* His *flesh shall be fresher than a child's, he shall return to the days of his youth.* He shall *pray unto God*, and he will be favourable unto him, and he shall *see his face with joy;* for he will render unto man his righteousness."‡ This is the most circumstantial account of GOD's dealing with HEZEKIAH, as it is told in the books of *Chronicles* and *Kings*. GOD had delivered him from perishing by the sword of Sennacherib: "In those days Hezekiah was sick unto death, and prayed unto the LORD: and he spake unto him, and he gave him a sign. But Hezekiah rendered not again, according to the benefit done unto him, for *his heart was lifted up.*"§ But the story is told more at large in the book of *Kings*:—"In those days was Hezekiah *sick unto death:* and the *Prophet* Isaiah, the son of Amos, came to him, and said unto him, Thus saith the LORD, Set thine house in order, for thou shalt die and not live. Then he turned his face to the wall, and *prayed unto the Lord.*—And it came to pass afore Isaiah was gone out into the middle court, that the word of the LORD came unto him, *saying, Turn again, and tell* Hezekiah, Thus saith the LORD, I have *heard thy prayer*, I have *seen thy tears:* Behold I will heal thee; *on the third day thou shalt go up unto the house of the Lord.* And Isaiah said, Take a lump of figs, and they took and laid it on the boil, *and he recovered.*"‖—The following words as plainly refer to the destruction of the first-born in Egypt, and Sennacherib's army ravaging Judea: *In a moment shall*

* Job xxiv. 9, 10; Exod. xxii. 26, 27. See also Deut. xxiv. 12, 17. † "Leges illæ in Dei tantum Pandectis inveniendæ sunt, nempe, *de vestibus pignori datis*, quibus de pecunia concredita cavebant debitores, ante solis occasum, restituendis."—*De Legibus Hebr. Rit.* vol. i. p. 263. ‡ Job xxxiii. 17, et seq. § 2 Chron. xxxii. 24, 25. ‖ 2 Kings xx. 1, et seq.

*they die, and the people shall be troubled at midnight and pass away, and the mighty shall be taken away without hand.** These likewise clearly allude to the Egyptian Darkness,—*from the wicked their light is withholden.*†

No one, I think, can doubt but that the following description of God's dealing with Monarchs and Rulers of the world, is a transcript of, or allusion to, a passage in the second book of Chronicles. Elihu (who is made to pass judgment on the dispute) says, *He withdraweth not his eyes from the righteous: but, with kings are they on the throne, yea he doth establish them for ever and they are exalted.* [This seems plainly to refer to the house of David, as we shall see presently.] He proceeds; *And if they be bound in fetters, and be holden in cords of affliction: then he sheweth their work, and their transgressions that they have exceeded. He openeth also their ear to discipline, and commandeth that they return from iniquity. If they obey and serve him, they shall spend their days in prosperity and their years in pleasure; but if they obey not, they shall perish by the sword,* &c.‡ Now hear the sacred Historian.—"God had said to David and to Solomon his son, In this house and in Jerusalem, which I have chosen before all the tribes of Israel, will I put my name for ever. Neither will I any more remove the foot of Israel from out of the land which I have appointed for your fathers, so that they will take heed to do all that I have commanded them.—So Manasseh made Judah and the Inhabitants of Jerusalem to err.—And the Lord spake to Manasseh, and to his people: but they would not hearken. Wherefore the Lord brought upon them the captains of the host of the king of Assyria, which took Manasseh amongst the thorns, and bound him with fetters, and carried him to Babylon. And when he was in affliction, he besought the Lord his God, and humbled himself greatly before the God of his Fathers, and prayed unto him, and he was entreated of him, and heard his supplication, and brought him again to Jerusalem into his kingdom. Then Manasseh knew that the Lord he was God." §

But the most extraordinary allusion of all to the *Jewish Œconomy*, and the most incontestable, is in the following words, where speaking of the *clouds of rain*, our translation has it, *He causeth it to come, whether for correction, or* FOR HIS LAND, *or for mercy.*‖ The Septuagint understood the sacred text in the same manner. Ταῦτα συντέτακται παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἐάν τε εἰς παιδείαν, ἐὰν εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ, ἐὰν εἰς ἔλεος εὑρήσει αὐτόν. The meaning of which is, he bringeth it at such junctures, and in such excess, as to cause dearth, [*for correction;*] or so timely and moderately, as to cause plenty, [*for mercy;*] or lastly, so tempered, in a long continued course, as to pro-

* Job xxxiv. 20. † Job xxxviii. 15. ‡ Job xxxvi. 7—12. § 2 Chron. xxxiii. 7—13. ‖ Job xxxvii. 13.

duce that fertility of soil which was to make one of the blessings of the promised land, [FOR HIS LAND:] a providence as distinct from the other two, of *correction* and *mercy*, as the genus is from the species. This is a sufficient answer to the learned Father Houbigant's criticism on this verse, who corrects the common reading of the Hebrew text, and thinks the words, *or for the land*, to be a marginal illustration crept into the text. St. Jerom, and the vulgar Latin, instead of,—*whether for* CORRECTION, *or for his land*, translate, sive in UNA TRIBU, *sive in terra sua*. If this be the true rendering of the Hebrew, then it plainly appears that the writer of the book of Job alluded to the words of his contemporary prophet, AMOS.—"And also I have witholden the rain from you, when there were yet three months to the harvest; and I caused it to rain upon one city, and caused it not to rain upon another city: one piece was rained upon, and the piece whereupon it rained not, withered." Without controversy, however, the Writer speaks of a SPECIAL PROVIDENCE upon God's own Land, the land of Judea; which plainly shows that the *peculiarity of the Jewish Œconomy* was still uppermost in his thoughts. In a word, this Œconomy is described by MOSES* as altogether different from that of other people. JOB'S account of God's Œconomy exactly quadrates with it. What are we then to think, but that there is a continued allusion to the LAW? in many places indeed so general, as not to be discovered without the assistance of those which are more particular. Besides, (which is the last observation I shall make on this point) in the management of these Allusions, we see, the Author has observed a strict *decorum:* and, to take off any offensive glare, has thrown over them a sober image of ancient manners. So that here we have the plain marks of former times intermixed with circumstances peculiar to the latter. What are we therefore to conclude, but that the Work is a species of dramatic writing, composed long after the age of the subject?

On the whole then it appears that this Objection of no allusions, which, if well grounded, had made nothing against the low date of a poetic Composition, is not indeed supported by fact: and this will be seen yet more fully hereafter.

But had the Objection any real foundation, They who make it, had been still much puzzled to account for the Author's silence concerning the *six days Creation*, and the institution of the *Sabbath;* as it must reduce them to the necessity of supposing that these things were unknown to JOB. And consequently, that the *Sabbath* was not a moral, but a positive Law only of the Jews; though Moses, to impress the greater reverence upon it, seems to make it coeval with the Creation. How they will get over this difficulty I know not. On the other

* Deut. iv. 39.

hand, They who, with the low date of this book of Job, hold the *Sabbath* to be a positive Law, will find no difficulty at all. For, as they would have put the mention of it, had it been mentioned, on the same footing with that of other things under the Mosaic Œconomy; so, the silence they will easily account for, on the received opinion of that time, that the *Sabbath* was a positive Law, instituted to separate and distinguish the Israelites from all others; and that therefore the mention of a thing so well known to be a Rite peculiarly Jewish, would have had an ill effect, in the mouths of men who lived before the Mosaic Law was given.

After such clear evidence that the book of Job was written under the Law, we have little need of Grotius's argument, for the support of this point, from the book's containing many passages similar to what we find in the Psalms. And it is well we have not, because I think his argument very equivocal. For if the sacred writers must needs have borrowed trite moral sentences from one another: it may be as fairly said, that the Authors of the Psalms borrowed from the book of Job; as that the author of Job borrowed from the book of Psalms. But Mr. Le Clerc would mend this argument, by refining upon it, a way that seldom mends any thing. He says, one may know an original from a copy, by the latter's having less nature and force; and he thinks he sees this in the book of Job.* Now admitting the truth of the observation, it would be so far from supporting, that it would overturn his conclusion. Mr. Le Clerc seems to have been misled into this criticism by what he had observed of writers of less polished ages borrowing from those of more. In this case, the copy will be always much inferior to the original. But the effect would have been just the contrary in a writer of the time of David borrowing from one of the time of Moses. And as the common opinion places the two books in those two different periods, they are to be supposed rightly placed, till the contrary be shewn. This observation we see verified in the Greek Authors of the Socratic age, and in the Roman authors of the Augustan, when they borrowed from their very early country writers. But the matter of fact is, I think, just otherwise. The advantage of the sublime in the parallel passages seems to lie on

* "Grotius croit avec beaucoup plus de vrai-semblance, que cet auteur est posterieur à David et à Salomon, dont il semble qu'il ait imité divers endroits, et remarque fort judicieusement, qu'il y a dans ce livre des manieres de parler, qu'on ne trouve que dans Esdras, dans Daniel, et dans les Paraphrases Caldaïques. *Codure*, dans son Commentaire sur Job, a aussi remarqué plusieurs Caldaismes dans ce livre, et quelques personnes savantes soûtiennent, que les Arabismes qu'on y croit avoir remarqué ne sont que des maniéres de parler Caldéenes. On y trouve des imitations de divers endroits des Pseaumes.—Mais vous me demanderez peut-être, comment on peut savoir, que c'est l'auteur du livre de Job qui a imité ces Pseaumes, et non pas les auteurs de ces Pseaumes qui ont imité le livre de Job? Il est aisé de vous satisfaire. On connoit, qu'un auteur en imite un autre, à ceci, c'est que l'imitation n'est pas si belle que l'original, qui exprime ordinairement les choses d'une maniere plus nette et plus naturelle que la copie."—*Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande*, p. 183.

the side of Job. And from hence we may draw Mr. Le Clerc's conclusion with much greater force. But indeed, take it either way, the argument, as I said, is of little weight. But it is pleasant to hear Schultens, and his epitomiser Dr. Grey, speak of the grandeur, the purity, and sublimity of the language spoken in the time of Job, as if the Hebrew had partaken of the nature and fortunes of the two languages made perfect by a long study of eloquence, in the Socratic and Augustan ages; and as if it was equally impossible for a Hebrew after the captivity (though inspired into the bargain) to imitate these excellencies of style, as for a writer of the iron age of Latin to have expressed the *beauty and weight* of Ennius's elegance. We know what Enthusiasm can do on every object to which it turns itself. There have been Critics of this sort, who have found, even in the Hebrew of the Rabbins, graces and sublimities of style to match those in the best Greek and Roman historians; though, in reality, the graces it boasts partake much of those we see in the Law-French of our English-Reporters. The truth is, the language of the times of Job had its grandeur, its purity, and sublimities: but they were of that kind which the learned Missionaries have observed in the languages of certain Warrior-tribes in North America. And this language of the time of Job preserved its genius to late ages, by the assistance of that uniformity of Character which makes the more sequestered inhabitants of the East so tenacious of all their ancient modes and customs.

2. We now come closer to the question; and having proved the book of Job to be written under the *Mosaic Œconomy*, We say further, that it must be *somewhere between the time of their approaching captivity, and their thorough re-establishment in Judea.* This is the widest interval we can afford it. The reason seems to be decisive. It is this, That no other possible period can be assigned, in which the GRAND QUESTION, debated in this book, could ever come into dispute. This deserves to be considered.

The question,* a very foreign one to us, and therefore no wonder it should have been so little attended to, is, *Whether God administers his government over men here with an equal providence, so as that the good are always prosperous, and the bad unhappy; or whether, on the contrary, there be not such apparent inequalities, as that prosperity and adversity often happen indifferently to good and bad. Job* maintains the latter part,† and his three friends the former. They argue these points throughout the whole book, and each party sticks firm to his first opinion.

Now this could never have been made matter of dispute, from the most early supposed time of Job's existence,‡ even to ours, in any

* See note P, at the end of this book. † See note Q, at the end of this book.
‡ See note R, at the end of this book.

place out of the land of Judea; the administration of Providence, which, throughout that large period, all People and Nations have experienced, being visibly and confessedly unequal. Men, indeed, at all times, have been indiscreetly prone to enquire how this inequality could be made consistent with GOD's justice or goodness: But, amidst the great variety of human opinions, as extravagant as many of those are which philosophic men have some time or other maintained, we do not find any of them ever held or conceived that *God's providence was equally administered.* This therefore, as we say, could be no question any where out of the land of Judea. But we say farther,

Nor in that land neither, in any period of the Jewish nation either before or after the time wherein we place it. Not *before*, because the dispensation of Providence to that people was seen and owned by all, to be equal: Not *after*, because by the total ceasing of God's extraordinary administration, the contrary was as evident.

Of this period then, there are three portions; 1. The time immediately *preceding* the captivity; 2. The *duration* of it; and 3. The *return* from it.

To the opinions which place it in either of the two first portions, as supposing it to be written for the consolation of the people going into or remaining in captivity, a celebrated Writer has opposed an unanswerable objection: "The Jews" (says he) "undoubtedly suffered for their iniquity; and the example of Job is the example of an innocent man suffering for no demerit of his own: Apply this to the Jews in their captivity, and the book contradicts all the Prophets before, and at the time of, their captivity, and is calculated to harden the Jews in their sufferings, and to reproach the Providence of GOD." *

There remains only the third portion; that is to say, the time of their return, and settlement in their own land. And this stands clear of the above objection. For the Jews came from the Captivity with hearts full of zeal for the Law, and abhorrence of their former idolatries. This is the account Ezra and Nehemiah † give of them: And with these dispositions, Jeremiah foretold, their restoration should be attended. *I will bring Israel again to his habitation, and he shall feed on Carmel and Bashan, and his soul shall be satisfied upon mount Ephraim and Gilead. In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the sins of Judah, and they shall not be found.*‡

3. We say then (to come home to the question) that the BOOK OF JOB was written some time between the return and the thorough settlement of the Jews in their own country.

* See note S, at the end of this book.
† Ezra iii. vi. Neh. iii. viii. ix.
‡ Jer l. 19, 20.

Having suited the *Time* to the People, let us try if we can suit the People to the *Subject;* and see whether this, which was foreign and unnatural to every other period, was proper and seasonable to this here assigned.

The Jews had hitherto, from their entrance into the land of Canaan to their last race of kings, lived under an extraordinary, and, for the most part, equal Providence. For these two states must be distinguished, and indeed are distinguished not only throughout this discourse, but throughout the whole Scripture history, although the terms, in both, be sometimes used indifferently to signify either one state or the other, where the nature of the subject leads directly to the sense in which they are employed. As their sins grew ripe and the time of their Captivity approached, God so tempered justice with his mercy, as to mix, with the prophetic denunciations of their impending punishment, the repeated promises of a speedy Return; to be attended with more illustrious advantages for the Jewish Republic than it had ever before enjoyed. The appointed time was now come. And their Return (predicted in so plain and public a manner) was brought about with as uncommon circumstances. Those most zealous for the Law, and most confiding in the promises of GOD, as instructed by their parents in all his extraordinary Dispensations, embraced this opportunity of returning to their own country, to promote the restoration of their Law and Religion. And who can doubt but that they expected the same manifestations of GOD's Providence in their Re-establishment, that their Forefathers had experienced in their first Settlement? That they were indeed full of these expectations appears from the remarkable account Ezra gives us of his distress, when about to return with Artaxerxes's commission, to regulate the affairs of Judea and Jerusalem. The way was long and dangerous; yet the Jews had told the king so much of their being under the peculiar protection of their God, that he was ashamed to ask a Guard for himself and his companions; and therefore had recourse to prayer and fasting: *Then I proclaimed a fast there at the river Ahava, that we might afflict ourselves before our God, to seek of him a right way for us, and for our little ones, and for all our substance. For I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen, to help us against the enemy in the way: because* WE *had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him, but his power and his wrath is against all them that forsake him.** But in these their expectations of the old extraordinary Providence, they were greatly deceived; and the long traverses they underwent from the malice and persecution of their

* Ezra viii. 21, 22.

idolatrous neighbours, made them but too sensible of the difference of their condition from that of their Forefathers, in their first establishment. What then must be their surprize and disappointment to find their expectations frustrate, and their Nation about to be reduced to the common level of the *People of the earth*, under the ordinary providence of Heaven? At first it would be difficult for many habituated to, and long possessed of, the notion of an extraordinary Providence, to comprehend the true state of their present circumstances. This astonishment is finely described in the following words of Job, *As for me, is my complaint to man? and if it were so, why should not my spirit be troubled? Mark me, and be* ASTONISHED, *and lay your hand upon your mouth. Even when I remember, I am afraid, and* TREMBLING *taketh hold of my flesh.* WHEREFORE *do the wicked live, become old, yea are mighty in power?* &c.*—But others less pious would fall into doubts about GOD'S justice; as not conceiving how he could discharge the expectations he had raised, without some very special regard to the safety of his chosen People: Nay there were some, as there always will be in national distresses of this nature, so impious as even to deny *the moral government* of God. Whom the Prophet Zephaniah thus describes,—"*Men that are settled on their lees; that say in their heart,* THE LORD WILL NOT DO GOOD, NEITHER WILL HE DO EVIL." † All would be in a state of anxiety and disorder. And this greatly increased, 1. From the bad situation of affairs *without:* For, till the coming of Nehemiah, the Walls of Jerusalem were in many places broken down; the Gates taken away; and the inhabitants exposed not only to the insults and ravages of their enemies, but to the reproach and contempt of all their neighbours, as a despicable and abandoned People. 2. From the bad situation of affairs *within:* Several disorders contrary to the Law had crept in amongst them; as the *marrying strange wives*, and practising *usury* with one another. Add to all this (what would infinitely increase the confusion), that a future state of Rewards and Punishments was not yet become a popular Doctrine. That this is a faithful account of their condition will be seen when we descend to particulars: That it would have this effect on the religious sentiments even of the better sort is evident from the expostulation of Jeremiah, in whose time this *inequality* first struck their observation, *Righteous art thou, O Lord*, (says he) *when I plead with thee: yet let me talk with thee of thy judgments.* WHEREFORE *doth the way of the wicked prosper? Wherefore are all they happy that deal very treackerously?* ‡ If it be said, "that the *inequality* could not now first strike their observation, in a Dispensation where the equal Providence had been gradually declin-

* Job xxi. 4—7. † Zeph. i. 12. ‡ Jer. xii. 1.

ing from the time of Saul;" I ask, Why not? Since there must be some precise point of time or other, when the fact was first attended to. And where can we find a more likely one than this?

Could any thing therefore be conceived more seasonable and necessary, at this time, than such a consolation as the book of Job afforded? In which, on a traditional story, of great fame and reputation over all the East, a good man was represented as afflicted for the trial of his virtue, and rewarded for the well-bearing his afflictions; and in which, their doubts concerning GOD'S Providence were appeased by an humble acquiescence under his almighty power. And, therefore, I suppose it was, that in order to quiet all their anxieties, and to comfort them under their present distresses, one of their Prophets at this very period composed the BOOK OF JOB. And here let me observe, that, to the arguments already given for fixing the date of the book of Job at this precise time of the Jewish Republic, may be added the following: Job says, *He knoweth the way that I take: When he hath* TRIED *me, I shall come forth as* GOLD.* But we have shewn, in speaking of what Maimonides calls the *Chastisements of Love*, that they were unknown to the Jewish religion till the times of their later Prophets.† Now here the *Chastisements of Love* are expressly described.

To proceed, If such were the end of composing this poetic story, we cannot but believe that every thing in it would be fitted to the circumstances of the times. But this could not be done without making the poem ALLEGORICAL as well as *dramatic*. That is, without representing the real persons of that age under the persons of the *drama*. And this would be according to the exactest rules of good writing: For when some *general moral* fitted for all times is to be recommended, it is best shewn in a simple DRAMATIC habit: but when the author's purpose is to convey some *peculiar truths*, circumscribed by time and place, they have need to be enforced by ALLEGORIC Images. And in fact, we shall find this poem to be wholly allegorical: The reason is convincing. There are divers circumstances added to each character, which can by no means belong to the persons *representing*: we conclude, therefore, that others are meant under those characters, namely, the persons *represented*. Nor did the Author seem much solicitous to conceal his purpose, while in his introduction to some of Job's speeches he expresseth himself in this manner,—*moreover Job continued his* PARABLE *and said*.‡ Which word *parable* properly signifies in Scripture the representing one thing by another. Jerom in his preface to the book of Job, if I understand him right, seems to say much the same thing. "OBLIQUUS enim etiam apud Hebræos totus liber fertur, et lubricus, et quod Græci Rhetores ἐσχηματισμένος,§

* Job xxiii. 10. † See book v. ‡ Job xxvii. 1; xxix. 1. § Λόγος.

DUM QUI ALIUD LOQUITUR, ALIUD AGIT: ut si velis anguillam vel murenulam strictis tenere manibus, quanto fortius presseris tanto citius elabitur." This description of the work, and the comparison by which Jerom illustrates his description, is a lively picture of an ALLEGORY; in which the literal sense, when you begin to grasp it closely, slips through your fingers like an eel. And in this sense we shall find the speeches of Job to be extremely *parabolical*. For it is to be observed, that, from this place, where Job is said to *continue his Parable*, from ch. xxvii. to chap. xxxi. which is the winding up of the controversy between him and his friends, there are more allusions to the Jewish state than in all the rest of the book together.—But to leave no room for doubt in this matter, let us now examine each character apart.*

I. In the person of JOB we have a good man afflicted, and maintaining his innocence; equally impatient of pain and contradiction; yet, at length with all submission bowing to the hand of GOD; and finally rewarded for it. Had this been a fictitious Character in an invented story, we could have only gathered this general moral from it, "That virtue and submission to the divine pleasure, notwithstanding the common frailties of humanity, will assuredly engage the care of Providence." But as this Hero of the poem was a real Personage; and so greatly famed for his exemplary patience in afflictions, that his case became proverbial;† we can never, on the common principles, account for his behaviour, when we find him breaking out ever and anon into such excesses of impatience as border nearly upon blasphemy.‡ The judicious Calmet cannot forbear observing on this occasion: "En effet Job avoit marqué dans ses plaintes une vivacité que pouvoit être interprétée en mauvaise part. Il s'etoit plaint de la rigueur de Dieu; il avoit deploré son malheur d'une maniere qui avoit besoin d'une interpretation bénigne."§ And to the same purpose Albert Schultens: "In eo excessu ut ne nunc quidem Jobum culpa liberare possumus, ita facile intelligitur, multo magis talibus dictis offendi tunc debuisse Elihuum, ignarum hactenus, quid Deus de Jobo ejusque causa pronunciaturus esset."‖ Thus softly do these Commentators speak, in their embarras to reconcile this representation of Job to his traditional Character for patience. The *Writing* then and the *Tradition* being so glaringly inconsistent, we must needs conclude, 1. That the fame of so great Patience arose not from this book. And 2dly, That some other Character, shadowed under that of Job, was the real cause of the Author's deviation from the general Tradition.

* See note T, at the end of this book. † *Ye have heard of the Patience of Job.* (James v. 11.) ‡ See note U, at the end of this book. § Sur Job xxxiii. 10. ‖ On the same place.

And this character, I say, was no other than the JEWISH PEOPLE. The singularity of whose situation as a *selected Nation* is graphically described in the beginning of the book, where Satan is brought in, speaking of the distinguished honour done to Job by his Maker. *Hast thou not made a* HEDGE *about him, and about his house, and about all that he hath, on every side?* * The great point which Job so much insists upon throughout the whole book is his *innocence:* and yet, to our surprise, we hear him, in one place, thus expostulating with GOD: *Thou writest bitter things against me, and makest me to possess the* INIQUITIES OF MY YOUTH.† This can be accounted for no otherwise than by understanding it of the PEOPLE: whose repeated iniquities on their first coming out of Egypt, were in every Age remembered, and punished on their Posterity. Again, the twenty-ninth chapter is an exact and circumstantial description of the prosperous times of the Jewish People; several parts of which can be applied with no tolerable propriety to the condition of a private man: —"O that I were as in the days when GOD preserved me, when his candle shined upon my head, and when, by his LIGHT, I walked through darkness: As I was in the days of my youth, when the SECRET OF GOD was upon my TABERNACLE:—When I washed my steps with BUTTER, and the rock poured me out rivers of OIL.—I put on righteousness and it clothed me: my judgment was as a robe and a diadem.—I brake the jaws of the WICKED, and pluckt the spoil out of his teeth.—I CHOSE OUT THEIR WAY, and sat chief, and dwelt as a KING in the army."‡ In these words the writer evidently alludes to the *pillar of fire* in the Wilderness;—The *Schekinah* in the tabernacle;—The *land flowing with milk and honey;*—The administration of the *judges;*—The curbing the ravages of the *Philistians;* —And the glory of their first *Monarchs.* Well therefore might the Writer, in his introduction to this speech, call it a PARABLE.

This will lead us next to consider the *Age*, as well as *People* meant. Job, speaking of his misfortunes, says: *For the thing which I greatly feared is come upon me, and that which I was afraid of is come unto me. I was not in safety, neither had I rest, neither was I quiet, yet trouble came.*§ But in other places he speaks very differently. He wishes *he were as in months past, for then* (says he) *I shall die in my nest, and I shall multiply my days as the sand.*‖ And again, *When I looked for good, then evil came upon me: and when I waited for light, there came darkness.*¶ These things are very discordant, if understood of one and the same person; and can never be reconciled but on the supposition of an *allegorical* reference to another Character; and, on that, all will be set right. For this disquiet, and fear of

* Job i. 10. † Job xiii. 26. ‡ Job xxix. 2, et seq. § Job iii. 25, 26. ‖ Job xxix. 18. ¶ Job xxx. 26.

approaching trouble, was the very condition of the Jews on their first return from the Captivity. Thus Ezra expresseth it: *And they set up the altar upon his bases (for fear was upon them, because of the people of those countries) and they offered burnt-offerings thereon unto the Lord.** And thus Zechariah, who prophesied at this time: *For before these days there was no hire for man, nor any hire for beast, neither was there any peace to him that went out or came in, because of the affliction; for I set all men every one against his neighbour.*† Job, amongst his other distresses, complains to God;—*Thou scarest me with dreams, and terrifiest me with visions:* ‡ this, I suppose, refers to the comminations of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, who all prophesied at this time, and were very troublesome on that account to the impatient Jews, to whose circumstances only, and spirit of complaint, these obscure words of Job, expostulating with GOD, can agree;—*and why dost thou not pardon my transgression, and take away mine iniquity? For now I shall sleep in the dust, and thou shalt seek me in the morning, but I shall not be.*§ There is not a more difficult passage in the whole book of Job; and yet, on the principles here laid down, it admits and conveys this natural and easy meaning, "In thus punishing, thou wilt defeat thy whole design. It is thy purpose to continue us a peculiar People; yet such traverses as we have met with, on our return, will soon destroy those already come into Judea, and deter the rest from hazarding the same fortune." Job goes on in the same strain: *Is it good unto thee that thou shouldest oppress? that thou shouldest despise the work of thine hands? and shine upon the counsel of the wicked?* ‖ The Jews of this time made this very complaint. *I have loved you, saith the Lord, yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us?* ¶ And again, *And now we call the proud happy; yea they that work wickedness are set up; yea they that tempt God are even delivered.***—But JOB goes on,—*O that thou wouldest hide me in the* GRAVE, *that thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath be past; that thou wouldest appoint me a set time, and remember me.*†† By which words, the complaints of the Jews of that time are again referred to; which were, as appears from the words of Job, to this effect: "Would to GOD we had still continued in Captivity [the *Grave*, which was the very figure used by the Prophets for the Captivity] expecting a more favourable season for our Restoration; or that we might be permitted to return unto it, 'till the remains of punishment for our forefathers' sins are overpast, and all things fitly prepared for our reception." And in these cowardly and impatient sentiments were they, on their Return, as were their Ancestors, on their first coming out of the land of Egypt; to which,

* Ezra iii. 3. † Zech. viii. 10. ‡ Job vii. 14. § Verse 21.
‖ Job x. 3. ¶ Mal. i. 2. ** Mal. iii. 15. †† Job xiv. 13.

this Return is frequently compared by the Prophets.—Job goes on expressing his condition in this manner: *His troops come together, and raise up their way against me, and encamp round about my tabernacle. He hath put my brethren far from me, and mine acquaintance are verily estranged from me. My kinsfolk have failed, and my familiar friends have forgotten me.** The first part of this complaint evidently relates to the *Arabians, the Ammonites, and the Ashdodites;* who (as Nehemiah tells us) *hearing that the walls of Jerusalem were made up, and that the breaches began to be stopped, were very wroth, and conspired all of them together to come and fight against Jerusalem and to hinder it.*† The second part relates to their rich Brethren remaining in Babylon, who seemed, by Nehemiah's account, to have much neglected the distressed Remnant that escaped from the Captivity to Jerusalem. *Then Hanani* (says he) *one of my brethren came, he and certain men of Judah, and I asked them concerning the Jews that had escaped, which were left of the Captivity, and concerning Jerusalem. And they said unto me, The Remnant that are left of the Captivity there in the Province are in great affliction and reproach: the wall of Jerusalem is also broken down, and the gates thereof are burnt with fire.*‡—Job goes on, *O that I knew where I might find him* [God], *that I might come even to his seat. Behold I go forward, but he is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive him: on the left hand where he doth work, but I cannot behold him: he hideth himself on the right hand, that I cannot see him.*§ Could any thing more pathetically express the lamentations of a People who saw the extraordinary Providence, under which they had so long lived, departing from them?—From GOD, Job turns to Man, and says, "But now they that are younger than I have me in derision, whose fathers I would have disdained to have set with the dogs of my flock. Yea, whereto might the strength of their hands profit me, in whom old age was perished? For want and famine they were solitary; fleeing into the Wilderness in former time desolate and waste: who cut up mallows by the bushes, and juniper-roots for their meat. They were driven forth from among men (they cried after them as after a thief) to dwell in the clifts of the valleys, in the caves of the earth, and in the rocks. Amongst the bushes they brayed, under the nettles they were gathered together. They were Children of *fools*, yea Children of *base* men: they were *viler* than the earth."‖ This is a description, and a very exact one, of the *Cutheans* or *Samaritans;* of their behaviour to the Jews; and the sentiments of the Jews concerning them. These *had him in derision*, he says, and so Nehemiah informs us: "But it came to pass, that when *Sanballat* heard that we builded

* Job xix. 12—14. † Neh. iv. 7, 8. ‡ Neh. i. 2, 3. § Job xxiii. 3, 8, 9. ‖ Job xxx. 1, et seq.

the wall, he was wroth, and took great indignation, and *mocked the Jews*. And he spake before his brethren and the army of Samaria, and said: What do these feeble Jews? will they fortify themselves? will they sacrifice? will they make an end in a day? will they revive the stones out of the heaps of the rubbish, which are burnt? Now *Tobiah* the Ammonite was by him, and he said, even that which they build, if a fox go up, he shall even break down their stone wall. Hear, O our GOD, for we are *despised*, and turn their *reproach* upon their own head."* And GOD, by the Prophet Malachi, tells the Jews the reason why he suffered them to be thus humbled: *Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the Law.*†—Job says he would *have disdained to have set these with the dogs of his flock, that they were younger than him, that they were children of fools, yea of base men, viler than the earth.* It is well known in what sovereign contempt the Jews held the Cutheans or Samaritans above all People. The character here given of the baseness of their Extraction, without doubt, was very just. For when a Conqueror, as here the king of Assyria, would repeople, with his own subjects, a strange country entirely ravaged and burnt up by an exterminating war, none but the very scum of a People would be sent upon such an errand. And by the account Ezra gives us of this Colony, as gathered out of many parts of the Assyrian Empire, we may fairly conclude them to be the offscourings of the East. "Then wrote Rehum the chancellor, and Shimshai the scribe, and the rest of their companions, the *Dinaites*, the *Apharsathchites*, the *Tarpelites*, the *Apharsites*, the *Archevites*, the *Babylonians*, the *Susanchites*, the *Dehavites*, and the *Elamites*, and the rest of the Nations whom the great and noble Asnapper brought over and set in the cities of Samaria."‡—Job describes them as being at first reduced to the utmost distresses for food and harbour, in *a desolate and waste wilderness*, living upon *roots*, and dwelling in *caves* and *clifts of the rock*: and assuredly such must have been the first entertainment of this wretched Colony, transplanted into a Country entirely wasted and destroyed by a three years incessant ravage.§ Nay, before they could come up to take possession of their *desolate places*, the wild beasts of the field were got before them, and a scourge of Lions prepared to receive them for their idolatrous pollutions of the holy Land.‖

Job has now ended his *Parable*; and GOD is brought in to judge the Disputants; whose speech opens in this manner: *Then the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said, Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?*¶ The character which

* Neh. iv. 1, et seq. † Mal. ii. 9. ‡ Ezra iv. 9, 10. § 2 Kings xvii. 5.
‖ Verse 25. ¶ Job xxxviii. 1, 2.

God here gives of Job is that which the Prophets give of the People of this time. *Ye have wearied the Lord with your words,** says Malachi. And again: *Your words have been stout against me, saith the Lord.*† But on Job's repeated submission and humiliation, GOD at length declares his acceptance of him. And thus he received the People into grace, as we learn by the Prophet Zechariah:—*Thus saith the Lord, I am returned unto Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem.*‡ It is added, *Also the Lord gave Job* TWICE *as much as he had before:* § and in the same manner GOD speaks to the People by the Prophet: *Turn ye to the strong-hold, ye prisoners of hope, even to-day do I declare that I will render* DOUBLE *unto thee.*‖—Job's brethren now came to comfort him, and *every man gave him a piece of money, and every one an ear-ring of gold.*¶ This, without question, alludes to the presents which Ezra tells us the Jews of Babylon made to their brethren in Judea: *And all they that were about them strengthened their hands with vessels of silver, with gold, with goods, and with beasts, and with precious things, besides all that was willingly offered.***—The history adds, *So the Lord blessed the latter end of Job more than the beginning:* †† and thus the future prosperity of the People was predicted by the Prophets of this time: *The glory of this latter house shall be greater than the former, saith the Lord of Hosts: And in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of Hosts.*‡‡ *For I, saith the Lord, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and will be the glory in the midst of her.*§§ The Book concludes with these words: *After this lived Job an hundred and forty years, and saw his sons, and his sons sons, even four generations. So Job died being old and full of days:* ‖‖ this too was the specific blessing promised by GOD to the People, in the Prophet Zechariah: *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, There shall yet old men and old women dwell in the streets of Jerusalem, and every man with his staff in his hand for very age. And the streets of the city shall be full of boys and girls playing in the streets thereof.*¶¶

II. The next Person in the drama is Job's WIFE. Let us take her, as she is presented to us, on the common footing. She acts a short part indeed, but a very spirited one. *Then said his wife unto him: Dost thou still retain thine integrity? Curse God and die.****Tender and pious! He might see, by this prelude of his Spouse, what he was to expect from his Friends. The Devil indeed assaulted Job, but he seems to have got possession of his Wife. Happiness was so little to be expected with such a Woman, that one almost wonders, that the sacred Writer, when he aims to give us the highest idea of Job's

* Mal. ii. 17. † Mal. iii. 13. ‡ Zech. viii. 3. § Job xlii. 10.
‖ Zech. ix. 12. ¶ Job xlii. 11. ** Ezra i. 6. †† Job xlii. 12.
‡‡ Haggai ii. 9. §§ Zech. ii. 5. ‖‖ Job xlii. 16, 17. ¶¶ Zech. viii. 4, 5. *** Job ii. 9.

succeeding felicity, did not tell us, in express words, that he lived to bury his Wife. In these modern ages of luxury and polished manners, a Character like this is so little of a prodigy, that both the learned and unlearned are accustomed to read it without much reflection: But such a Woman in the age of Job had been thought to need a Lustration. In the history of the Patriarchs we have a large account of their Wives; but these are all examples of piety, tenderness, and obedience; the natural growth of old simplicity of manners. Something lower down, indeed, we find a *Delilah;* but she was of the *uncircumcised,* a pure Pagan; as, on examination, I believe, this Wife of Job will prove: another very extraordinary circumstance in her Character. For the Patriarchs either took care to marry Believers, or, if haply idolaters, to instruct them in the true Religion; as we may see by the history of Jacob.—*Then said his wife unto him, Dost thou still retain thine* INTEGRITY? THUMMAH, *perfectio,* that is, *Religion.* This was altogether in the Pagan mode; Idolaters, as we find in ancient story, generally growing atheistical under calamities.* —*Curse God,* BARECH, *benedic-maledic:* here rightly† translated *curse.* So the *Syr.* and *Arab.* versions, *Conviciare Deo tuo.* This was another Pagan practice, when they had implored or bribed the Gods to no purpose. Thucydides affords us a terrible instance: When the Athenians in the height of their prosperity went upon the Syracusian Expedition, the Fleet set sail amidst the prayers and hymns of the Adventurers: but on its unhappy issue, these very men, on the point of their fatal dispersion, prosecuted the same Gods with the direst curses and imprecations.‡—*Curse God and* DIE; that is, offer violence to yourself. Another impiety of Paganism; which, under irretrievable misfortunes, deemed suicide not only just but laudable. A crime much abhorred by the Hebrews, as forbidden by their Law; till, in after-times, they became corrupted by Gentile manners. All this shews the Woman to have been a rank idolater. But Job's reply seems to put this suspicion out of doubt: *Thou speakest as one of the* FOOLISH WOMEN *speaketh. What? Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?* § *A* FOOLISH WOMAN is a Hebrew phrase to signify a *foreign woman,* an *Idolater,* a *Prostitute;* for these qualifications were always joined together in their ideas. On this account the *Chald. Paraph.* explains it, *Sicut una de mulieribus quæ operantur ignominiam in domo patris sui.* So David, speaking of the condition of the Pagan world, says: *The* FOOL *hath said in his heart,*‖ i. e. the PAGAN; and in the character Job gives of the *Cutheans,* quoted above, he calls them *Chil-*

* See note X, at the end of this book. † See note Y, at the end of this book.
‡ Ἀντὶ δ' εὐχῆς τε καὶ παιάνων, μεθ' ὧν ἐξέπλεον, πάλιν τούτων τοῖς ἐναντίοις ἐπιφημίσμασιν ἀφορμᾶσθαι.—Lib. vii. § 75, ed. Hudsoni. § Job ii. 10. ‖ Psalm xiv. 1; liii. 1.

dren of FOOLS;* that is, of Gentile extraction, as indeed they were. Now can we suppose that Job would marry an Infidel, in a country which abounded with true believers? *Job*, who thought idolatry *a crime to be punished by the Judge?* These are difficulties not to be gotten over on the received idea of this book; and appeared so great to Cocceius and Schultens, the two most elaborate of Job's Commentators, that they are for glossing the kind Woman's words into an innocent or excusable sense; though her Husband's reply so unavoidably confines them to a bad one: *Thou speakest* (says he) *as one of the foolish women speaketh. What? Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?* Besides, they did not consider that *Satan* had, as it were, engaged that Job should *curse God to his face;*† which impiety he was here endeavouring to bring about by his agent, the Woman. But now, on our interpretation, it will be found that this character was introduced with exquisite art and contrivance. We have observed, that this *Remnant of the Captivity* returned into their own Country with hearts full of zeal for the Law. Yet, with this general good disposition, there was one folly they were still infected with, and that was the taking *strange wives* of the idolatrous nations round about; which, amongst other, had this terrible inconvenience, that the children, who in their tender years are principally under the care of the mother, would be early tainted with Pagan principles: a mischief so general that Hosea calls the children of such marriages, *strange children*,‡ i. e. *idolatrous*. This soon became a crying enormity. Their Prophets awaked them with the thunder of divine menaces; and their Rulers improved their penitence to a thorough reformation. *Judah* (saith the Prophet Malachi) *hath dealt treacherously, and an abomination is committed in Israel and in Jerusalem: For Judah hath profaned the holiness of the Lord which he loved, and hath married the daughter of a strange God. The Lord will cut off the man that doth this.*§ Nehemiah informs us of his zeal against this offence: *In those days also saw I Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab: And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and pluckt off their hair, and made them swear by God, saying, Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons nor take their daughters unto your sons, or for yourselves.*‖ But Ezra gives us a very circumstantial account of the Crime and of the Reformation: *Now when these things were done, the Princes came to me, saying, The People of Israel, and the Priests, and the Levites, have not separated themselves from the people of the lands, doing according to their abominations: for they have taken of their daughters for themselves and for their sons; so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people of those lands: Yea,*

* Job xxx. 8. † Job ii. 5. ‡ Hosea v. 7. § Mal. ii. 11, 12. ‖ Neh. xiii. 23, 25.

*the hand of the Princes and Rulers hath been chief in this trespass.** Shechaniah then encourages Ezra to reform this abuse.† Ezra assembles the people: ‡ they promise amendment; and propose a method of Inquiry: *Let now our Rulers of all the congregation stand, and let all them which have taken strange wives in our cities, come at appointed times, and with them the Elders of every city, and the Judges thereof.*§ Ezra approved of this method, *And they set down in the first day of the tenth month to examine the matter. And they made an end with all the men that had taken strange wives by the first day of the first month.*‖ The state and condition of a weak and thin Colony, 'tis probable, encouraged them in this transgression: yet, as it was so expressly against the LAW, they were altogether without excuse: And indeed, the prohibition was an admirable expedient against idolatry; *strange wives* inevitably drawing the wisest, as it did Solomon himself, into foreign idolatries. On this account the Prophet quoted above, finely calls them *the daughters of a* STRANGE GOD. Jeremiah gives us a remarkable instance of their influence over their husbands in his time: *Then all the men which knew that their wives had burnt incense unto other Gods, and all the women that stood by, a great multitude, even all the people that dwelt in the land of Egypt, in Pathros, answered Jeremiah, saying, As for the word that thou hast spoken unto us in the name of the Lord, we will not hearken unto thee.*¶ And Nehemiah had good reason to tell these Transgressors,—*Did not Solomon king of Israel sin by these things? Yet among many nations was there no king like him, who was beloved of his God, and God made him King over all Israel: Nevertheless even him did outlandish women cause to sin.*** For Ezra expressly assures us, that those who had taken *strange* women were drawn into *the abominations of the people of the lands.*††

The sacred Writer, therefore, who composed his work for the use of these People represented under the person of Job, could not better characterize their manners, nor give them a more useful lesson, than by making Job's wife, the author of such wicked counsel, a *Heathen.* It was indeed the principal study of their Rulers to deter them from these marriages, and to recommend the *daughters of Israel;* of whom the Prophet *Malachi* thus speaks: *Because the Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant.*‡‡ This will help us to clear up a difficulty in the conclusion of the book which very much perplexes the Commentators: (where, let it be observed, his *misfortunes* are called his CAPTIVITY; §§ which figure, of

* Ezra ix. 1, 2. † Ezra x. 2. ‡ Verse 7. § Verse 14. ‖ Verses 16, 17. ¶ Jer. xliv. 15, 16. ** Neh. xiii. 26. †† Ezra ix. 1. ‡‡ Mal. ii. 14. And see note Z, at the end of this book. §§ Job xlii. 10.

the species for the genus, could hardly be of use in the Jewish language till after their repeated punishments by *Captivities.)* *So the Lord blessed the latter end of Job—He had also seven sons and three* DAUGHTERS. *And he called the name of the first* Jemima, *and the name of the second* Kezia, *and the name of the third* Keren-happuch. *And in all the land were no women found so fair as the daughters of Job, and their father gave them inheritance among their brethren.** *Albert Schultens* says : † "Men are wont to ask why the names of Job's sons are suppressed, and the names of his daughters only mentioned. The Ancients have recourse to mystery in this case, and trifle strangely with the etymologies of *Jemima*, *Kezia*, and *Keren-happuch :* which are commonly supposed to signify Diana or the day, Cassia, and the horn of antimony. In these, they find just so many characters of the Church ; which to the splendor of truth, joins the odour of virtue, that she may stand a perfect beauty in presence of her spouse, &c. &c. Others make them symbolical appellations, by which the happy father would represent the former splendor, fame and glory of his family returned again unto it." And Mr. Le Clerc on the same place ; ‡—"If it is asked why the names of the daughters are recorded and not the sons : Of this, no reason can be given, unless, perhaps, the daughters were more illustrious. These names are urged as a certain proof of its being a true history. But who can say how far the oriental writers were wont to go, in dressing out their Parables ? In a Gospel parable we find the name of Lazarus ; which does not on that account hinder us from considering the story as of that class. However we think it best to leave the matter just as we found it." But now all this difficulty is removed, and the passage is seen in its full force and beauty. It was the writer's design to recommend the *daughters of Israel* as the most desirable Parties, [*And in all the land were no women found so fair as the daughters of Job ;*] and to commemorate the reformation now made amongst the *people*, when they put away their *strange wives*, and took an oath to share the holy inheritance, for the future, only with the *daughters of Israel.—And their father gave them inheritance amongst their brethren :* words that have been as troublesome to the Commentators as the rest ; and have

* Job xlii. 12, et seq. † "Cur suppressis filiorum nominibus, filiarum illa apposita sint, quæri solet. Ad *mysterium* confugiunt veteres, mire ludentes in etymis *Jemimæ*, *Ketziæ*, et *Keren-happuchæ*, sive *Dianæ* vel *Diei*, *Cassiæ*, *et Cornu stibii*, ut vulgato hæc convenire visum. In his inveniunt totidem characteres *Ecclesiæ*, quæ cum splendore lucis conjungat odorem fragrantissimum virtutis, ut tota pulchra sponso suo sistatur, &c. &c. Alii symbolicas has faciunt appellationes, quibus familiæ suæ redivivam lucem, famam, gloriam repræsentatam voluerit fortunatissimus pater." ‡ *Quæritur cur sint filiarum nomina memorata, non filiorum ; cujus rei ratio reddi non potest, nisi fortè illustriores fuerint filiæ. Hæc nomina proferuntur, ut argumentum certum, quo constet hanc veram esse historiam. Sed quis dicat quò usque Orientales parabolas ornare solebant ? In parabola Evangelica est quidem nomen* Lazari, *quod non obstat quo minus Parabola habeatur. Verum rem in medio relinquimus.*

occasioned many a learned Dissertation *de Jure Successionis apud Hebræos, Arabas, Græcos, Latinos, et quamplurimos Gentes.*

III. We come next to Job's THREE FRIENDS.—Their solemn appointment to go and comfort Job; the neglect of their errand when they came thither; their inhumanity and strange humour of contradiction; have been already taken notice of, and explained, and reconciled to decorum, on the nature and principles of a *dramatic* composition. But this is not all: We find, on the issue of their debate, so many marks of insult, falshood, and malice, that we must needs conclude their Friendship to have been all pretence; that they were enemies in their hearts; and that the true purpose of their visit was to imbitter and aggravate his miseries. This requires other principles to explain it: for, in the *historical* part they are represented as *real* friends: and this makes such a difficulty as nothing but our idea of the work can remove. Who then will doubt but that, as the PEOPLE were represented under Job, these *three friends* were their three capital Enemies, who so greatly hindered and obstructed the rebuilding Jerusalem and the temple, SANBALLAT, TOBIAH, and GESHEM? Of whom Nehemiah gives us this account: *Then I came to the governors beyond the river, and gave them the king's letters. When* Sanballat *the Horonite, and* Tobiah *the servant the Ammonite, heard of it, it grieved them exceedingly that there was come a man to seek the welfare of the children of Israel.** And again: *But it came to pass that when* Sanballat, *and* Tobiah, *and the Arabians, and the Ammonites, and the Ashdodites heard that the walls of Jerusalem were made up, and that the breaches began to be stopped, then they were very wroth, and conspired all of them together, to come and to fight against Jerusalem and to hinder it.*† When force would not do, they assayed fraud: *Now it came to pass, when* SANBALLAT, *and* TOBIAH, *and* GESHAM *the Arabian, and the rest of our enemies, heard that I had builded the wall, and that there was no breach left therein, then* Sanballat *and* Geshem *sent unto me, saying, Come, let us meet together in some one of the villages in the plain of Ono: but they thought to do me mischief.*‡ The Writer of the book of *Tobit* seems to have had this idea of the three friends, where he says: *Nam sicut beato Job insultabant Reges, ita isti parentes et cognati ejus irridebant vitam ejus.*§ But we are to observe this is now only to be found in the Latin translation, which, St. Jerom tells us, he made from the Chaldee. But, what is still of more moment, is a paragraph at the end of the Septuagint translation of the book of Job, which makes of these three friends, two Kings and a Tyrant.

The marks of resemblance between the *allegorical* and *real* persons, are many and strong.

* Neh. ii. 9, 10. † Neh. iv. 7, 8. ‡ Neh. vi. 1, 2. § Tobit ii. 14.

Eliphaz, Bildad, and *Zophar,* are delivered as the allies and friends of Job: So *Sanballat* the Horonite had given his daughter to one of the sons of Joiada the son of Eliashib the high priest: * And *Tobiah* had made two alliances with the Jews: his son Johanan had married the daughter of Meshullam the son of Berechiah; and he himself had taken to wife the daughter of Shechaniah the son of Arah.†

Eliphaz, Bildad, and *Zophar,* came in a friendly manner with offers of service and assistance: So did these enemies of the Jews, as we are informed both by Ezra and Nehemiah: "Now when the ADVERSARIES of Judah and Benjamin heard that the children of the captivity builded the temple unto the Lord God of Israel: Then they came to Zerubbabel, and to the chief of the fathers, and said unto them, LET US BUILD WITH YOU. But Zerubbabel and Jeshua and the rest of the chief of the fathers of Israel, said unto them, You have nothing to do with us to build a house unto our God, but we ourselves will build unto the Lord God of Israel, as king Cyrus the king of Persia hath commanded us."‡ And Nehemiah's answer to *Sanballat, Tobiah,* and *Geshem,* shews, they had made this request:—"then answered I them, and said unto them, The God of heaven he will prosper us; therefore we his servants will arise and build, *but you have no portion, nor right, nor memorial in Jerusalem.*" § And of *Tobiah* in particular, he says: *Moreover in these days the nobles of Judah sent many letters unto* Tobiah: *and the letters of* Tobiah *came unto them. Also they reported his good deeds before me, and uttered my words to him. And* Tobiah *sent letters to put me in fear.*‖

The *three Friends of* JOB were worshippers of the true God; and so were these *Adversaries* of the JEWS: For, when, in the place quoted above, they asked to *build with* the Jews, they give this reason of their request: FOR WE SEEK YOUR GOD *as ye do, and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Eserhaddon king of Assur, which brought us up hither.*¶

The *three Friends* were perpetually deriding and upbraiding him for his sins: And of this Job frequently complains in the course of the disputation.** So Nehemiah tells us, that *when* Sanballat *the Horonite, and* Tobiah *the servant, the Ammonite, and* Geshem *the Arabian, heard that they were set upon building the walls of Jerusalem, they laughed them to scorn, and despised them, and said, What is this thing that ye do? Will ye rebel against the king?* †† And again: *But it came to pass that when* Sanballat *heard that we builded the wall, he was wroth, and took great indignation, and mocked the Jews. Now* Tobiah *the Ammonite was by him, and he said, Even that which they build, if a*

* Neh. xiii. 28. † Neh. vi. 18. ‡ Ezra iv. 1—3. § Neh. ii. 20.
‖ Neh. vi. 17, 19. ¶ Ezra iv. 2. ** Job iv. 17; xii. 4; xiii. 4; xvi. 2, 20; xvii. 2; xix. 2; xxi. 3; xxvi. 4 †† Neh. ii. 19.

*fox go up, he shall even break down their stone wall.** God, by the Prophet Malachi, tells them, *Judah hath profaned the holiness of the Lord which he loved, and hath married the daughter of a strange God.*† And it is remarkable that they with whom the Jews had committed this crime, as *Sanballat, Tobiah,* and *the Cutheans,* were made the instruments of their punishment.—Eliphaz the Temanite charges and upbraids Job with the most flagitious crimes: *Is not thy wickedness great, and thine iniquities infinite?* ‡ And thus the Cutheans represented the Jews to Artaxerxes: "Be it known unto the king, that the Jews, which came up from thee to us, are come unto Jerusalem, building the rebellious and the bad city, and have set up the walls thereof.—Therefore have we certified the king that search may be made in the book of the records of thy fathers, so shalt thou find in the book of the records, and know, that this city is a rebellious city, and hurtful unto kings and provinces; and that they have moved sedition within the fame of old time; for which cause was this city destroyed." §—If their Adversaries could accuse them thus unjustly, we are not to think they would spare them where there was more ground for condemnation. When Nehemiah came to the administration of affairs, the Rich had oppressed the Poor by a rigorous exaction of their debts: *And there was a great cry of the people and of their wives, against their brethren the Jews. For there were that said, We, our sons, and our daughters, are many: therefore we take up corn for them, that we may eat and live. Some also there were that said, We have mortgaged our lands, vineyards, and houses, that we may buy corn because of the dearth. There were also that said, We have borrowed money for the king's tribute, and that upon our lands and vineyards. Yet now our flesh is as the flesh of our brethren, our children as their children: and lo we bring into bondage our sons and our daughters to be servants, and some of our daughters are brought into bondage already, neither is it in our power to redeem them; for other men have our lands and vineyards.*‖ This abuse Nehemiah reformed: and in reproving the oppressors, he said: *It is not good that ye do: Ought ye not to walk in the fear of our Lord, because of the* REPROACH OF THE HEATHEN OUR ENEMIES? ¶ which *reproach* was intended to be represented in these words of Eliphaz: *For thou hast taken a pledge from thy brother for nought, and stripped the naked of their cloathing.***

But the *three Friends* are at length condemned by God himself: *The Lord said to Eliphaz the Temanite: My wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends: For ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath.*†† And in the same

* Neh. iv. 1, 3. † Mal. ii. 11. ‡ Job xxii. 5. § Ezra iv. 12, 14, 15.
‖ Neh. v. 1, et seq. ¶ Verse 9. ** Job xxii. 6. †† Job xlii. 7.

manner he speaks, by the Prophet, concerning these *Adversaries* of the Jews: *And I am very sore displeased with the Heathen that are* AT EASE: *For I was but a* LITTLE DISPLEASED, *and they* HELPED FORWARD THE AFFLICTION.*—His sentence against the three Friends goes on in these words: *Therefore take now unto you seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt-offering, and my servant Job shall pray for you, for him will I accept: Lest I deal with you after your folly, in that ye have not spoken of me the thing which is right, like my servant Job.*† This, I suppose, is designed to represent the defeat of their *Adversaries*, in the decree which the Jews, by the good providence of GOD, procured from Darius, commanding the *Cutheans* (who had hitherto so much hindered) now to assist the Jews to the utmost of their power in rebuilding the Temple: "Then Darius the king made a decree—Now therefore Tatnai, Governor beyond the river Shetharboznai, and your companions the Apharsachites, which are beyond the river, be ye far from thence: Let the work of this house of God alone, let the governor of the Jews, and the elders of the Jews, build this house of God in his place. Moreover I make a decree, what ye shall do to the elders of these Jews, for the building of this house of God: that, of the king's goods, even of the tribute beyond the river, forthwith expences be given unto these men, that they be not hindered. And that which they have need of, both young bullocks and rams, and lambs, for the BURNT-OFFERINGS of the God of heaven, wheat, salt, wine, and oil, according to the appointment of the priests which are at Jerusalem, let it be given them day by day without fail; that they may offer sacrifices of sweet savours unto the God of heaven, and pray FOR THE LIFE OF THE KING AND OF HIS SONS." ‡

The reason why the *three Friends* are condemned as *not having spoken of God the thing that was right* was, 1. Because using the argument of an *equal Providence* only to condemn Job with the heart of an enemy, they made the honour of God a stale to their malignant purposes. To understand this more fully we must consider that the great contest was concerning an *equal Providence:* What occasioned it was their suspicion of Job's secret iniquity; consequently these two points take their turns occasionally in the course of the disputation. Job, after many struggles, at last gave up the general question; but the particular one of his own righteousness, he adheres to, throughout, and makes it the subject of all he says from chap. xxvii. to chap. xxxi. This ended the dispute: for, in the beginning of the next chapter,§ the writer tells us,—*So these three men ceased to answer Job, because he was righteous in his own eyes;* that is, they

* Zech. i. 15. † Job xlii. 8. ‡ Ezra vi. 1, 6, et seq. § Job xxxii.

gave Job this contemptuous reason why they would argue no longer with him. By this we may see, how finely the dispute was conducted, to answer, what I suppose was, the end of writing the book. JOB, who represented the PEOPLE, was to speak their sentiments concerning their doubts of an equal Providence; but he was at last to acquiesce, to teach them a lesson of obedience and submission.

2. The second reason of the condemnation of these false *Friends* was, because they had supported their condemnation of Job by a pretended Revelation.—*Now a thing was secretly brought to me* (says Eliphaz) *and mine ear received a little thereof. In thoughts from the visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth on men, fear came upon me, and trembling, which made all my bones to shake: then a Spirit passed before my face, the hair of my flesh stood up; I stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof: an image was before mine eyes, there was silence, and I heard a voice saying,* "Shall mortal man be more just than God," &c.* This was the character, and conduct, of the enemies of the Republic, as the Prophet Ezekiel informs us; whose words are so very apposite, that we may well think they were the original to those above in the fourth chapter of Job. *Thus saith the Lord God, Wo unto the foolish Prophets that follow their own spirit and have seen nothing—They have seen vanity and lying divination, saying, The Lord saith; and the Lord hath not sent them. —Have ye not seen a vain vision, and have ye not spoken a lying divination, whereas ye say, The Lord saith it, albeit I have not spoken? Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Because ye have spoken vanity and seen lyes, therefore behold I am against you, saith the Lord God.*†

IV. The last Person in the Opposition is the Devil himself, SATAN, the Author and Contriver of all the mischief. And now we are come to that part of the *Allegory*, where the fable and the moral meet, and, as it were, concur to throw off the Mask, and expose the true face of the Subject; this assault upon JOB being that very attack which, the Prophet Zechariah tells us, Satan made, at this time, on the PEOPLE. The only difference is, that, in this Poem, it is *Job*; in that Prophecy, it is *Joshua the high priest*, who stands for the *People*. In all the rest, the identity is so strongly marked, that this single circumstance alone is sufficient to confirm the truth of our whole interpretation. There needs only setting the two passages together to convince the most Prejudiced:—The Historian says, "Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and SATAN came also among them. And the Lord said unto Satan: Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from

* Job iv. 12, et seq. † Ezek. xiii. 3, et seq.

walking up and down in it. And the Lord said unto Satan: Hast thou considered my servant JOB, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil? Then Satan answered the Lord and said: Doth Job fear God for nought? But put forth thine hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse thee to thy face. And the Lord said unto Satan: Behold all that he hath is in thy power, only upon himself put not forth thine hand. So Satan went forth from the presence of the Lord." *—The Prophet's account is in these words: "Be silent, O all flesh, before the Lord: for he is raised up out of his holy habitation. And he shewed me JOSHUA the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and SATAN standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord said unto Satan: The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan, even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem, rebuke thee: Is not this a brand pluckt out of the fire? Now *Joshua was clothed with filthy garments,* and stood before the angel. And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, *Take away* the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold I have *caused thine iniquity to pass from thee,* and I will clothe thee with change of Raiment. And I said, Let them set a fair mitre upon his head; so they set a fair mitre upon his head, and clothed him with garments, and *the angel of the Lord stood by.*" † JOB's whole dramatic life lies here in its stamina.—*Satan standing at the angel's right hand to resist Joshua* is, (when drawn out more at length) his persecution of Job.—*Joshua clothed with filthy garments,* is Job amidst the Ashes.—The *clothing of Joshua with change of raiment and setting a fair mitre on his head,* is Job's returning Prosperity. And *the angel of the Lord standing by,* is GOD's Interposition from the Whirlwind.

But we have not yet done with this Character. The finding SATAN in the scene is a strong proof that the Work was composed in the age we have assigned to it. This evil Being was little known to the Jewish People till about this time. Their great Lawgiver, where he so frequently enumerates, and warns them of, the snares and temptations which would draw them to transgress the Law of GOD, never once mentions this Capital enemy of Heaven; yet this was an expedient which the wisest Pagan Lawgivers ‡ thought of use, to keep the Populace in the ways of virtue. Thus Zaleucus, in the preface to his book of Laws, speaks of *an evil* DEMON *tempting men to mischief:* And in the popular Religion there was always a FURY at hand, to pursue the more atrocious Offenders through the world. Nay, when the end of that sacred History which Moses composed, obliged him to

* Job i. 6, et seq. † Zech. ii, 13; iii. 1, et seq. ‡ See "Divine Legation," vol. i. book ii. p. 188, et seq.

treat of *Satan's* first grand machination against mankind, he entirely hides this wicked Spirit under the Animal which he made his instrument. (The reason of this wise conduct hath been in part explained already, and will be more exactly treated in the course of our general argument.*) But as the fulness of time drew near, they were made more and more acquainted with this their capital Enemy. When Ahab, for the crimes and follies of the People, was suffered to be infatuated, we have this account of the matter in the first book of Kings: *And Micaiah said: Hear thou therefore the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said: Who shall persuade Ahab that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a* SPIRIT *and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his Prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also; Go forth and do so.*† SATAN is not here recorded by name; and so we must conclude that the People were yet to know little of his *history:* However, this undertaking sufficiently declared his *nature.* On the return from the Captivity, we find him better known; and things then are ascribed to him, as the immediate and proper Author, which (while divine Providence thought fit to keep back the knowledge of him) were before given, in an improper sense, to the first and ultimate Cause of all things. Thus, in the second book of Samuel, it is said, that GOD moved David to number the people,—*And again, the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go number Israel and Judah.*‡ But in the first book of Chronicles, which was written after the Captivity, *Satan* is said to have moved David to this folly. *And* Satan *stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel.*§ For, His history having an inseparable connexion with the *Redemption* of Mankind, the knowledge of them was to be conveyed together: and now, their later Prophets had given less obscure descriptions of the REDEEMER and the other attendant truths.

Here let me stop a moment, though I anticipate my subject, to adore the visible splendor of the divine Wisdom, in this period of GOD's moral Dispensation: We have observed that the fulness of time approaching, the writings of the Prophets, after the Captivity, had given less obscure intimations of the *Redemption;* and that the Truths, which had a necessary connexion with it, were proportionably

* See note AA, at the end of this book. † 1 Kings xxii. 19, et seq. ‡ 2 Sam. xxiv. 1. § 1 Chron. xxi. 1.

laid open. Two of the principal of these were the HISTORY OF SATAN and the DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE; which, soon after this time, were conveyed to their knowledge. Now, besides the use of these two truths to the general Œconomy, they were of great advantage to the Jewish people at those very junctures when each was first made known unto them. The *history of Satan*, it is evident, they were brought acquainted with in their *Captivity*; and nothing could better secure them from the dangerous error of the TWO PRINCIPLES, which was part of the national Religion of the Country into which they were led captive. The *doctrine of a future state* they learnt some small time after their thorough *Re-establishment*; and this being at a time when their extraordinary Providence was departed from them, was of the highest advantage and support to them, as a Nation and a People. But this, as I say, is anticipating my subject, and will be explained at large hereafter: The other is the point we are at present concerned with, namely, the knowledge of this wicked Spirit; and the security this knowledge afforded, against the error of the *two Principles*: Which leads us to another use the writer of the book of Job hath made of this *Personage* of the Drama.

We have observed, that the principal design of the Author of this work was to remove all errors, concerning the SUPREME CAUSE from amongst a People now about to come under the *ordinary* Providence of Heaven, after having been long accustomed to the *extraordinary*. The common fault which the Ancients were prone to commit, on seeing good and bad happen indifferently to all men, was to bring in question the GOODNESS of their Maker. And they were apt to satisfy themselves in this difficulty, by another mistake as absurd as that was impious; the belief of TWO PRINCIPLES, a Good and an Evil. The Jews, of this time particularly, were most obnoxious to the danger, as coming from a place where this strange Doctrine made part of the public Religion. It was of the highest importance therefore to guard against both these errors. And this the sacred Writer hath effectually done, by shewing that SATAN, or the *evil Spirit* (whose history, misunderstood, or imperfectly told, in the first Ages of mankind, much favoured the notion of an *evil Principle)* was, like all other immaterial Beings, even of the highest rank, a creature of GOD; at enmity with him; but entirely in his power; and used by him as an instrument to punish wicked men; yet sometimes permitted to afflict the Good, for a trial of their patience, and to render their Faith and Virtue more perfect and conspicuous. Hence we see (which deserves our serious reflection) how useful it was to this purpose (what little light soever it gave to the Question) to resolve all, when the dispute came to be moderated and determined, into the

OMNIPOTENCE OF GOD, who is represented as the SOLE Creator and Governor of all things. And, what the Wisdom of the Holy Spirit directed the Writer of the book of Job to do, in this point, on their *coming* from the Land which held the belief of TWO PRINCIPLES, the same Wisdom directed Isaiah to do, on their going thither. This Prophet, in the person of God, addressing his speech to Cyrus, whom God had appointed to be the instrument of his People's Restoration, says: *I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God besides me. I girded thee, though thou hast not known me.*—I FORM THE LIGHT AND CREATE DARKNESS, I MAKE PEACE AND CREATE EVIL: *I the Lord do all these things.**

This declaration of God by Isaiah naturally leads us, ere we conclude this head, to consider another text of the book of Job, which confirms all that is here said of SATAN and the TWO PRINCIPLES; and, by consequence, the opinion here advanced, of the time in which the book was written. Job, speaking of the works of Creation and Providence, says, *He divided the* SEA *with his power, and his understanding smiteth through the* PROUD.†—This evidently alludes to the miracle of the *Red-sea*, and the destruction of *Pharaoh*. From these works of Providence upon earth, the writer proceeds to speak of God's work of Creation above; both *material* and *intellectual*.—*By his Spirit he hath* GARNISHED *the heavens; his Hand hath formed the* CROOKED SERPENT;‡ i. e. He made the material and intellectual world; and in this latter, the *evil Being* himself, (that pretended Rival of his power, and Opposer of all his good) is equally the work of his hands. The progression and connexions of the parts, contained in this whole period, are extremely beautiful. His work of Providence, as Lord of Nature upon earth, led properly to his work of Creation above, as the Maker and Governor of all things: and his chastisement of the proudest and most powerful Monarch then on earth, in his character of Governor of the Moral world, as naturally introduced the mention of his creating, and his keeping in subjection, the EVIL SPIRIT, in his character of the first Cause of all things. And, to connect these two relations together with the greater justness, the writer with much elegance calls the *evil Spirit* by that name wherewith the sacred Writers, and especially Isaiah, (whom we shall see presently the writer of the book of Job had particularly in his eye) denote the king of Egypt. *In that day the Lord, with his sore and great and strong sword, shall punish Leviathan the piercing serpent, even Leviathan that* CROOKED SERPENT, *and he shall slay the Dragon that is in the sea.*§ Let us observe, that the Writer of the book of Job, in the last verse, evidently alludes to, or rather paraphrases those words of Isaiah quoted before.—*I form the light and*

* Isai. xlv. 5, 7. † Job xxvi. 12. ‡ Verse 13. § Isai. xxvii. 1.

create darkness; I make peace, and CREATE EVIL: *I the Lord do all these things:* For what is this but *garnishing the Heavens,* and FORMING THE CROOKED SERPENT? But the relation and connexion between the 12th and 13th verses * not being observed, several eminent Commentators, both Jews and Christians, were inclined to understand the *crooked serpent* as signifying the great Constellation so named, situate near the arctic pole; or at least, that enormous trail of light called the Galaxy or Via lactea. And those Moderns who have been as backward to find a Devil for their Tempter, as a God for their Redeemer, thought it agreed best with their Socinian reasoning-scheme; the general mention of the *garniture of the Heavens,* being well followed by a particular description of one of its pieces of furniture. But whatever their force of Logic may be, their taste of Rhetoric seems none of the best. It is a strange kind of amplification to say, "He made all the constellations, and he made one of them." But that interpretation of Scripture which receives its chief strength from the rules of human eloquence, and art of composition, hath often but a slender support. I shall go on therefore to shew, that an Hebrew Writer (and he who, after all that has been said, will not allow the Author of the book of Job to be an Hebrew, may grant or deny what he pleases, for me)—to shew, I say, that *an Hebrew Writer,* by *the crooked Serpent* could not mean a *Constellation.*

The Rabbins tell us, (who in this case seem to be competent Evidence) that the ancient Hebrews in their Astronomy, which the moveable Feasts of their Ritual necessitated them to cultivate, did not represent the Stars, either single or in Constellations, by the name or figure of any Animal whatsoever; but distinguished them by the letters of their alphabet, artificially combined. And this they assure us was the constant practice, till, in the later ages, they became acquainted with the Grecian Sciences: Then, indeed, they learnt the art of tricking up their SPHERE, and making it as picturesque as their neighbours. But still they did it with modesty and reserve; and hesitated even then, to admit of any human Figure. The reason given for this scrupulous observance, namely, the danger of Idolatry, is the highest confirmation of the truth of their account. For it is not to be believed, that, when the ASTRONOMY and SUPERSTITION of Egypt were so closely colleagued, and that the combination was supported by this very means, the NAMES given to the Constellations, it is not to be believed, I say, that Moses, who, under the ministry of God, forbad the Israelites *to make any likeness of any thing in* HEAVEN *above* according to the old mode, would suffer them to make *new likenesses* there: which, if not in the first intention set up to be

* Job xxvi.

worshiped, yet, we know, never waited long to obtain that honour. To corroborate this Rabbinical account relative to the Hebrew Astronomy, we may observe, that the Translators of the Septuagint, the Heads and Doctors of the Jewish Law, who must needs know what was conformable to the practice derived from that law, understood the Writer of the book of Job to mean no more nor less than the DEVIL by this periphrasis of the *crooked Serpent;* and so translated it, ΔΡΑΚΟΝΤΑ ΑΠΟΣΤΑΤΗΝ, the *apostate Dragon.*

From all this it appears, that neither MOSES nor ESDRAS could call a Constellation by the name of the *crooked Serpent.*

V. The last Actor in this representation, is Job's fourth friend, ELIHU *the son of Barachel the Buzite,* who is brought upon the stage in the thirty-second chapter. He is made to reprove Job with great asperity; and, like the other three, to have his *wrath kindled against him:* and yet, to the surprise of all the Commentators, he is not involved in their Sentence, when GOD passes judgment on the Controversy. Here again, the only solution of the difficulty is our interpretation of the book of Job. Elihu's opposition was the severity of a true friend; the others' the malice of pretended ones. His severity against Job arose from this, that *Job justified himself rather than God,** that is, was more anxious to vindicate his own innocence than the equity of God's Providence. For under the person of ELIHU was designed the *sacred Writer himself.* He begins with the character of a true Prophet, under which, as in the act of inspiration, he represents himself. *I am full of matter, the Spirit within me constraineth me. Behold my belly is as wine which hath no vent, it is ready to burst like new bottles.*† And this he contrasts with the character of the false Prophets of that time,—*Let me not, I pray you, accept any man's person, neither let me give flattering titles unto man.*‡ But all this will appear from the following considerations.

Elihu, on the entrance upon his argument, addresses the three friends in the following manner: *Now he hath not directed his words against* ME: *neither will I answer him with* YOUR *speeches.*§ This sufficiently discriminates his cause and character from theirs. He then turns to Job: "My words" (says he) "shall be of the *uprightness* of my heart; and my lips shall utter *knowledge* clearly. The *Spirit of God hath made me,* and the *breath of the Almighty* hath given me *life.* If thou canst answer me, set thy words in order before me, and stand up. BEHOLD I AM, ACCORDING TO THY WISH, IN GOD'S STEAD: I also am formed out of the clay," *&c.*‖ This clearly intimates the character of God's chosen Servant: These were of approved integrity, they received the divine inspiration, and

* Job xxxii. 2. † Verses 18, 19. ‡ Verse 21. § Verse 14.
‖ Job xxxiii. 3, et seq.

were therefore in *God's stead* to the People. Elihu goes on in the same strain.—"He excites Job to attention,—accuses him of charging GOD with injustice,—reproves his impiety,—tells him that men cry in their afflictions, and are not heard for want of faith:—that his sins hinder the descent of GOD's blessings; whose wisdom and ways are unsearchable."—But is this the conversation of one private man to another? Is it not rather a public exhortation of an Hebrew Prophet speaking to the People? Hence too, we may see the great propriety of that allusion to the case of Hezekiah,* mentioned above, which the writer of the book of Job, in this place, puts into the mouth of Elihu. The Spirit with which Elihu speaks is farther seen from his telling Job that *he desires to justify him.*† And yet he accuses him of saying, *It profiteth a man nothing, that he should delight himself with God:*‡ and expostulates with him yet further; *Thinkest thou this to be right that thou saidst, My righteousness is more than God's? For thou saidst, What advantage will it be unto thee, and what profit shall I have, if I be cleansed from my sin?*§ Here the Commentators are much scandalized, as not seeing how this could be fairly collected from what had passed: yet it is certain he says no more of Job than what the Prophets say of the People represented under him. Thus Malachi: "Ye have wearied the Lord with your words: yet ye say, Wherein have we wearied him? When ye say, *Every one that doth evil is good in the sight of the Lord, and he delighteth in them; or, Where is the God of judgment?*"‖ And again: *Ye have said, It is vain to serve God: and what profit is it, that we have kept his ordinance, and that we have walked mournfully before the Lord of hosts? And now we call the proud happy: yea they that work wickedness are set up; yea they that tempt God are even delivered.*¶ It was this which kindled Elihu's wrath against Job; who, in this work, is represented to be really guilty; as appears not only from the beginning of GOD's speech to him; ** but from his own confession,†† which follows. It is remarkable that Job, from the beginning of his misfortunes to the coming of his three comforters, though greatly provoked by his Wife, *sinned not* (as we are told) *with his lips.*‡‡ But, persecuted by the malice and bitterness of their words, he began to lay such stress on his own innocence as even to accuse the justice of GOD. This was the very state of the Jews at this time: So exactly has the sacred Writer conducted his allegory! They bore their straits and difficulties with temper, till their enemies the *Cutheans*, and afterwards *Sanballat*, *Tobiah*, and the *Arabians* confederated against them; and then they fell into indecent murmurings

* Job xxxiii. 18, et seq. † Verse 32. ‡ Job xxxiv. 9. § Job xxxv. 2, 3. ‖ Mal. ii. 17. ¶ Mal. iii. 14, 15. ** Job xxxviii. †† Job xlii. 1, et seq. ‡‡ Job ii. 10.

against GOD. And here let us observe a difference in the conduct of Elihu and the three friends, a difference which well distinguishes their characters: They accuse Job of *preceding* faults; Elihu accuses him of the *present*, namely, his impatience and impiety: which evidently shews that *his* charge was *true*, and that theirs was unjust.*

Again, Elihu uses the very same reasonings against Job and his three friends,† which are afterwards put into the mouth of GOD himself,‡ resolving all into his OMNIPOTENCY. *Elihu's* speech is indeed in every respect the same with GOD'S, except in the severity of his reproof to Job. And, in that, the Writer hath shewn much address in conducting his subject. The end and purpose of this Work was to encourage the Jews to a perseverance in their duty from the assured care and protection of Providence. At the same time, as they were growing impatient, it was necessary this temper should be rebuked. But as the ordonance of the Poem is disposed, the putting the reproof into the mouth of the Almighty would have greatly weakened the end and purpose of the Work. This part therefore is given to his servant Elihu: and GOD'S sentence is all grace and favour on the side of Job, and indignation and resentment against his false Friends. For this event, the Writer had finely prepared us, in making Job, in the heat of the disputation, say to these friends, *Wilt thou speak wickedly for God? and talk deceitfully for him? Will ye accept his person? will ye contend for God? Is it good that he should search you out? or as one man mocketh another do ye so mock him?* HE WILL SURELY REPROVE YOU, *if ye do secretly accept Persons.*§ The judicious reader will observe another artful circumstance in the cast of Elihu's oration. The three friends, in the grand question concerning an *equal Providence*, went directly over to one side, and Job to another: Elihu inclines to neither, but resolves all into submission to the Almighty power of GOD. For it was yet inconvenient to acquaint the Jews, (who were just going to fall under a *common Providence)* with the truth of their case. Hence, to observe it by the way, another circumstance arises to determine the date of the poem. We have shewn that the *Subject* suited only this time: We now see that the *manner* of treating the Subject could agree to no other. On the whole, this intermediate speech of Elihu's was the finest preparative for the decisive one which was to follow.

Farther, The true character of Elihu is seen from hence, that Job replies nothing to these words, as conscious of the truth of his reproofs; and that they were the reproofs of a Friend. And, indeed, his submission, on this occasion, was to represent the repentance of

* See note BB, at the end of this book. † From chap. xxxii. to xxxvii.
‡ From chap. xxxviii. to xlii. § Job xiii. 7, 8, et seq.

the Jews on the preaching of their Prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.

But lastly, Elihu's not being involved in the condemnation of the three friends is the most convincing argument of his very different Character. This, as we have said, exceedingly perplexed the Commentators. But where was the wonder, he should be acquitted, when he had said nothing but what GOD himself repeated and confirmed? What is rather to be admired is the severe sentence passed upon the three friends; and that, for the crime of *impiety*. A thing utterly inexplicable on the common interpretation. For let them be as guilty as you please, to Job, they are all the way advocates for GOD; and hold nothing concerning his Government that did not become his Nature and Character. But let us once suppose, these three friends to represent the Adversaries of the Jews, and the difficulty ceases. All their pretences are then hypocritical: and they impiously assume the Patronage of GOD only to carry on their malice to more advantage against Job. Why the Writer of this book did not *openly* expose the wickedness of their hearts, as is done in the book of Ezra and Nehemiah, was because the nature of the work would not suffer it; the question in debate, and the managers of the question, necessarily requiring that the part they took should have a specious outside of piety and veneration toward GOD. In a word, Job is made to say something wrong, because he represents the impatient Jews of that time: His three false friends, to say something right, because the nature of the drama so required: And Elihu to moderate with a perfect rectitude, because he represented the person of a Prophet.

But to see the truth of this interpretation in its best light, one should have before one's eyes all those difficulties with which the Commentators of the book of Job are entangled at almost every step. A view of this would draw us into an unreasonable length. I shall only take notice of one of the most judicious of them, (who has collected from all the rest) in the very case of this Elihu. CALMET characterises the fourth friend in this manner: *There was now none but Elihu the youngest and least judicious that held out against Job's arguments—Elihu here by a vain parade and overflow of words gives a reason, &c.** Again: *Elihu was given to represent one who knew not how to be silent, a great talker.*† And again: *It cannot be denied but that there is a mixture of ignorance and presumption in what Elihu says: and, above all, a strange prejudice and visible injustice in*

* "Il n'y eut qu'Eliu, qui étoit le plus jeune et le moins judicieux, qui ne se rendit pas—par un vain etalage des paroles Eliu rend ici raison," &c.—Sur chap. xxxii. 1.
† "Pour designer un homme qui ne se peut taire, un grand causeur."—Sur chap. xxxii. 18.

*most of the accusations he brings against Job.** This he says indeed. But when he comes to find Elihu escape GOD's condemnation, in which the other three are involved, he alters his note, and unsays all the hard things he had thrown out against him. *Although Elihu* (says he) *had mistaken the sense of his friend's words, yet, for all that, God seems, at least, to have approved his intention, because when he declares to Job's friends that they had spoken amiss, and commands them to offer up burnt-offerings for themselves, he only speaks of Bildad, Eliphaz, and Zophar, without mentioning Elihu. Besides, Job answers not a word to this last, and by his silence seems to approve of his discourse.*† GROTIUS, who strove to be more consistent in his character of Elihu, which yet his acquittal in GOD's sentence will not suffer any Commentator to be, upon the received idea of this Book, has run into a very strange imagination. He supposes Elihu might be a domestic, or retainer to one of the three friends, and so be involved in the condemnation of his principal.‡—But, now mark the force of prejudice to inveterate notions! It is visible to every one who regards the two speeches of Elihu and GOD with the least attention, that the doctrine and the reasoning are the same. Yet Calmet's general character of Elihu is, that there is *a vain parade and overflow of words;* that there is a *mixture of ignorance and presumption,* and *a visible injustice, in most of the accusations he brings against Job.* And yet of GOD's speech he says, *Here we have* A CLEAR SOLUTION *of the difficulties which had perplexed and embarrassed these five friends.*§—Pity that this *clear solution* should turn out to be no *solution* at all.

III. Having thus fixed the date of the book, our next enquiry will be concerning its AUTHOR. That it was composed by an inspired writer is beyond all question. Not only its uncontroverted reception and constant place in the Canon, and its internal marks of divinity, which this Exposition has much illustrated and enlarged, but its being quoted as inspired scripture by St. Paul,‖ will suffer no reasonable man to doubt of it. By this time therefore, I suppose, the Reader will be beforehand with me in judging it could scarce be any other than EZRA himself: who was a *ready scribe in the Law of*

* "On ne peut nier qu'il n'y ait et de l'ignorance et de la presumption dans ce que dit Eliu, et, sur tout, une etrange prevention et une injustice visible dans la plupart des accusations qu'il forma contre Job."—Sur chap. xxviii. 2. † "Quoiqu'Eliu eût mal pris le sens des paroles de son ami, toutefois Dieu semble approuver au moins son intention; puisque lorsqu'il declare aux amis de Job qu'ils ont mal parlé, et qu'il ordonne qu'on offre pour eux des holocaustes, il ne fait mention que de Bildad, d'Eliphaz, et de Sophar, sans parler d'Eliu. De plus, Job ne repond point à ce dernier, et par son silence il semble approuver son discours." ‡ "Elihu hîc non nominatur, ut nec supra ii. 11, fortè quod assecla esset alicujus trium."—In cap. xlii. 7. § "C'est ici le denouement de la piece, et la solution des difficultez qui avoient été agitées entre ces cinque amis." ‖ 1 Cor. iii. 19. *He taketh the wise in their own craftiness.* (Job v. 13.)

Moses, and had *prepared his heart to seek the Law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments.** For he had the welfare of his People exceedingly at heart, as appears from the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. And this of Job, we have shewn, was written purposely for their instruction and consolation. He made a correct edition of the Scriptures, settled the Canon, and *added in several places throughout the books of his edition, what appeared necessary for the illustrating, connecting, or compleating of them.*† He is reasonably supposed to be the author of the two books of Chronicles and the book of Esther. It was a common tradition too amongst the Jews, that he was the same with Malachi. And his great reputation as *a ready scribe in the Law of Moses*, apparently gave birth to that wretched fable of the destruction of the Scriptures in the Babylonian captivity, and Ezra's re-production of them by divine inspiration.

Thus is our interpretation of the BOOK OF JOB so far from taking away any dignity, or authenticity it was before possessed of, that it establishes and enlarges both. The shewing it principally respected a whole People highly ennobles the subject: and the fixing an anonymous writing on one of the most eminent of GOD'S Prophets greatly strengthens its authority. But the chief advantage of my interpretation, I presume, lies in this, That it renders one of the most difficult and obscure books in the whole Canon, the most easy and intelligible; reconciles all the characters to Nature, all the arguments to Logic, and all the doctrines to the course and order of GOD'S Dispensations. And these things shewing it superior, in excellence, to any human Composition, prove, what universal Tradition hath always taught, that it is of divine Original.

II.

Having brought down the date of this book so low, it is of little importance to our subject, whether the famous passage in the nineteenth chapter be understood of a RESURRECTION *from the dead*, or only of TEMPORAL DELIVERANCE *from afflictions*.‡ Yet as our interpretation affords new assistance for determining this long debated question, it will not be improper to sift it to the bottom.

I make no scruple then to declare for the opinion of those who say that the words [*I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth. And though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God. Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another*],§ can signify no more than JOB'S confidence in a TEMPORAL DELIVERANCE; as all agree they *may* signify. And therefore I shall the less insist

* Ezra vii. 6, 10. † PRIDEAUX'S "Connection," part i. book 5. ‡ See note CC, at the end of this book. § Job xix. 25, et seq.

upon a common observation, "That our Translators, who were in the other opinion, have given a force to their expression which the Original will by no means bear."

My reasons are these, 1. To understand the words, of a *Resurrection*, is repugnant to the whole tenor of the Argument: and to understand them of a *temporal deliverance*, is perfectly agreeable thereto. 2. The end and design of the Composition, as explained above, absolutely requires this latter sense, and disclaims the former. 3. The former sense is repugnant to Job's own express declaration in other places.

I. We must observe that the book of Job is strictly argumentative: and though sententious, and abounding with poetic figures, yet they are all subservient to the matter in dispute. In this respect, much unlike the writings of David and Solomon, which treat of divine or moral matters in short and detached sentences. On which account, the ablest of those, who go into the sense of a *Resurrection*, have found the necessity of reconciling it to the Context. Thus much being granted, we argue against the sense they put upon it, from these considerations. 1. First the Disputants are all equally embarrassed in adjusting the ways of Providence. Job affirms that the Good man is sometimes unhappy: yet he appears to regard that Dispensation as a *new thing* and matter of wonder, *upright men shall be astonished at this*;* which our interpretation well accounts for. The *three friends* contend that the Good man can never be unhappy, because such a situation would reflect dishonour on God's attributes. Now the doctrine of a *Resurrection*, supposed to be here urged by Job, cleared up all this embarras. If therefore his Friends thought it true, it ended the dispute: if false, it lay upon them to confute it. Yet they do neither: they neither call it into question, nor allow it to be decisive. But, without the least notice that any such thing had been urged, they go on, as they began, to inforce their former arguments, and to confute that which, they seem to understand, was the only one Job had urged against them, *viz.* The *consciousness of his own innocence*. But to be a little more particular. It fell to Zophar's part to answer the argument contained in the words in question, which I understand to be this—"Take," says Job, "this proof of my innocence: I believe, and confidently expect, that God will visit me again in mercy, and restore me to my former condition." To this Zophar, in effect, replies: But why are you so miserable now? For he goes on, in the twentieth chapter, to describe the punishment of the Wicked to be just such a state as Job then laboured under. He does not directly say, *The Good are not miserable;* but that follows from the other part of the proposition (which he here inforces as being a little more decent) *The bad are never happy*. Now suppose Job spoke

* Job xvii. 8.

of the *Resurrection*, Zophar's answer is wide of the purpose. 2. But what is still more unaccountable, Job, when he resumes the dispute, sticks to the argument he first set out with; and though he found it gave his Friends little satisfaction, yet he repeats it again and again. But this other argument of a *Resurrection*, so full of Piety and Conviction, which they had never ventured to reply to, he never once resumes; never upbraids his Adversaries for their silence; nor triumphs, as he well might, in their inability to answer it. But, if ever it were the object of their thoughts, it passed off like a Dream or Reverie to which neither side gave any attention. In a word, the Dispute between Job and his Friends stands thus: They hold, that if GOD afflicted the Good man, it would be unjust; therefore the Good man was not afflicted. Job says, that GOD did afflict the Good man: but that Reason must here submit, and own God's ways to be inscrutable. Could he possibly rest in that answer, how pious soever, if he had the more satisfactory solution of a FUTURE STATE? To this let me add, that if Job spoke of a *Resurrection*, he not only contradicts the general tenor of his argument, maintained throughout the whole disputation, but likewise what he says in many places concerning the *irrecoverable dissolution* of the body.* It is true, that even in the sense of a *temporal deliverance* he contradicts what he had said, in his despair, in the seventeenth chapter: But there is a manifest difference between a contradiction of *opinion and belief*, as in the first case; and of *passion and affection* only, as in the latter. And for this contradiction he seems to apologize, when he comes to himself, by desiring that this confidence in his Deliverer might be engraved on a Rock, as the opinion he would stand to. 3. But what is strangest of all, When each party had confounded themselves, and one another, for want, as one would think, of this principle of a *Resurrection*, which so easily unraveled all the perplexities of the dispute, the fourth Friend, the Moderator, steps in, as the precursor of the Almighty, who afterwards makes his appearance as the great Decider of the Controversy. Here then we might reasonably expect the Doctrine of the *Resurrection* to be resumed; and that the honour of the solution which it affords, was reserved for These; but, to our great surprise, they neither of them give us the least hint concerning it.—Those who contend for this interpretation suppose that the notion was here delivered in order to support its truth. What reason then can they give why neither the Moderator nor Decider should employ it, to clear up

* See Job vii. 9, 21; x. 21; xvi. 22; xiv. 7, et seq. Could one who said, *For there is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again*, &c. *But man dieth*, &c. could such a one (I speak of the personated character) think of the body like him who said, *But some man will say, How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die. And that which thou sowest thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or some other grain*, &c.

difficulties, when Job himself had touched upon it before? Elihu justifies God's conduct; God bears witness to Job's innocence: yet both concur in resolving all into Power Omnipotent. This tends more to cloud than clear up the obscurities of the debate: Whereas the doctrine of a *Resurrection* had rendered every thing plain and easy. In a word, no solution is given, though a decision be made. All this, on the common System, is quite unaccountable to our faculties of understanding.

Let us see next whether my sense of the words agree better with the tenor of the Dispute. Job, now provoked past sufferance at the inhumanity and malice of his pretended Friends, gives himself up to despair;* and seems, as we have observed, to contradict that part of his position which he had hitherto held,† "that God would at length bring the Good man out of trouble." For which being reproved by Bildad *(Shall the earth be forsaken for thee? and shall the* ROCK *be removed out of his place?*‡ i. e. because it is thy pleasure so obstinately to maintain that God does not govern by equal Laws, shall it therefore be so? The consequence of which would be a speedy desolation.—Shall the *Rock* § or Providence of God be removed to humour your passions?) Job recollects himself in the nineteenth chapter, and comes again to his former mind. He begins by complaining of their cruel usage: Says, that if indeed he were in an error, his case was so deplorable that they ought rather to treat him with indulgence: that this was no season for severity: begs they would have pity on him; and then retracts what had fallen from him in the anguish and bitterness of his soul: and lastly delivers this as his fixed sentiment, in which he was determined to abide; (and in which he had indeed acquiesced, till made impatient and desperate by the harshness of their treatment) namely, that God would at length bring the Good man out of trouble. I KNOW THAT MY REDEEMER LIVETH, &c. Which he introduces thus: *Oh that my words were now written, Oh that they were printed in a book, that they were graven with an iron pen and lead, in the rock for ever.*‖ As much as to say, What I uttered just before, through the distemperature of passion, I here retract, and desire may be forgotten, and that this may be understood as my fixed and unshaken belief.¶ And in this sentiment, it is remarkable, he henceforward perseveres; never relapsing again into the like extrava-

* Job xvii. † Job xiii. 15, 16; xiv. 13. ‡ Job xviii. 4. § By the ROCK I suppose is meant the *extraordinary Providence of God;* this being the common name by which it went amongst the Jewish people. *He is the* Rock, *his work is perfect; For all his* Ways *are Judgment.* (Deut. xxxii. 4.) *The* Rock *of his Salvation.* (Verse 15.) *Of the* Rock *that begat thee.* (Verse 18.) *Except their* Rock *had sold them.* (Verse 30.) *Their* Rock *is not as our* Rock, *even our Enemies themselves being Judges.* (Verse 31.) *Their* Rock *in whom they trusted.* (Verse 37.) *Neither is there any* Rock *like our God.* (1 Sam. ii. 2.) *The* Rock *of* Israel *spake to me.* (2 Sam. xxiii. 3.) *O* Rock, *thou hast established them.* (Hab. i. 12.) And a great number of other places. ‖ Job xix. 23, 24. ¶ See note DD, at the end of this book.

gance of passion. Which conduct agrees exactly with his general Thesis, "that Providence is not equally administered; for that the Good Man is frequently unhappy, and the Wicked prosperous; yet that, at last, God will bring the Good Man out of trouble, and punish the Wicked doers."

II. In the second place, if I have given a right interpretation of the book of Job, a *temporal deliverance*, and not the *resurrection of the body*, must needs be meant: For the moral of the dramatic piece was to assure the *People*, represented under the person of this venerable Patriarch, of those great temporal blessings which the three Prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, had predicted, in order to allay that tumult of mind which arose in every one, on seeing the extraordinary Providence, which protected their Forefathers, now just about to be withdrawn from them.

III. Thirdly and lastly, To understand these words of a *resurrection of the body*, expressly contradicts Job's plain declaration against any such hope, in the following words, *As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away, so he that goeth down to the grave, shall come up no more.** Again,—*So man lyeth down and riseth not till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep.*† And again, *If a man die, shall he live again?* ‡ Clarius and Drusius on the words, *till the heavens be no more*, say, "*Intellige in æternum*—est sensus, nullo unquam tempore, nam cœlum semper erit." It is not in human language to express a denial of the *Resurrection of the body* in stronger or plainer terms. So that it is no wonder the SADDUCEES should, as they always did, urge the first of these texts as the palmary argument against the Pharisees; but as an argument *ad homines* only, for they refused to have their opinions tried by any thing but the *Law of Moses*. However, to make it pertinent to the support of their impiety, they understood the book of Job to be an inspired relation of a *real* conference between the Patriarch and his Friends. And give me leave to observe, that my Adversaries who have the same idea of this book will never be able to acquit the Prophet of this impious Sadducean opinion. Whereas the dramatic nature of it, here contended for, frees him entirely from the charge; which I desire may be accepted as another proof of the truth of our general interpretation of the Work. Manassah Ben Israel, who holds that Job taught the very contrary to a future State (not apprehending the nature of the Composition) has a whole chapter against the Sadducees, to shew, that this makes nothing against the reality of such a State.

I cannot better conclude what hath been here said, on this famous passage, or better introduce what will be said on others to come next

* Job vii. 9. † Job xiv. 12. ‡ Verse 14.

under examination, than with the judicious remark of an ancient Catholic Bishop, on this very book: IT IS FIT WE SHOULD UNDERSTAND NAMES AGREEABLY TO THE NATURE OF THE SUBJECT MATTER; AND NOT MOLD AND MODEL THE TRUTH OF THINGS ON THE ABUSIVE SIGNIFICATION OF WORDS.* This, though a maxim of the most obvious reason, can never, in theologic matters especially, be too often inculcated. How usual is it, for instance, to have the following words of St. Paul quoted as a proof for the general resurrection of the dead, by those who (as the good Bishop says) *mold the truth of things on the abusive signification of words.* "He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you."†

III. But as the *terms,* in this passage of Job, are supposed, by me, to be metaphorical, and to *allude* to the restoration of a dead body to life, some have ventured to infer, that those who use such terms and make such allusions must needs have had the saving knowledge of the thing alluded to, *Resurrection of the Body:* And the following observation has been repeated, by more than one Writer, with that air of complacency, which men usually have for arguments they think unanswerable—*If the Scriptures speak of temporal misfortunes and deliverance, in terms of death and a Resurrection, then the doctrine of a resurrection must have been well known, or the language would have been unintelligible. And here I will lay down this rule, All words that are used in a figurative sense, must be first understood in a literal.*‡

This looks, at first sight, like saying something; but is indeed an empty fallacy; in which two very different things are confounded with one another; namely, the *idea* of a Resurrection, and the *belief* of it. I shall shew therefore that the very contrary to the first part of the learned Doctor's observation is true, and that the latter is nothing to the purpose.

I. The Messengers of God, prophesying for the people's consolation in disastrous times, frequently promise a restoration to the former days of felicity: and to obviate all distrust from unpromising appearances, they put the case even at the worst; and assure the People, in metaphorical expressions, that though the Community were as entirely dissolved as a dead body reduced to dust, yet God would raise that community again to life. Thus Isaiah: *Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise: Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust: For thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead.*§ And that we may have no

* Πλὴν καὶ τά ὀνόματα προσήκει νοεῖν πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὑποκειμένων πραγμάτων φυκνότητα, καὶ οὐ πρὸς τὴν κατάχρησιν τῶν λέξεων τ' ἀληθῆ κανονίζειν.—SERV. in *Catena Græca* in Job. † Rom. viii. 11. ‡ DR. FELTON'S "Two Sermons before the University of Oxford," pp. 18, 19. § Isai. xxvi. 19.

doubt of the Prophet's meaning, he himself explains it afterwards in the following words: * *And I will camp against thee round about, and I will lay siege against thee with a mount, and I will raise forts against thee. And thou shalt be brought down, and shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be low out of the dust, and thy voice shall be as one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust.* Nothing could be more plain or simple than such a metaphoric image, even amongst men who had no knowledge that the natural body was indeed to rise again; because every man knowing what it is to *live* and to *die*, every man knows what it is to *revive*, this being only an idea compounded of the other two: So that we see there was no occasion for the *doctrine of the Resurrection* to make *the language intelligible*.

Nay farther, this metaphorical expression must have there most efficacy where the *doctrine of the Resurrection* was unknown. For we have observed it was employed to inspire the highest sentiments of God's Omnipotency; but that always strikes the mind most forcibly which is as well *new* as *superior* to its comprehension. Therefore *life from the dead* was used, (and from the force with which a new idea strikes) it became almost proverbial in the writings of the Prophets, to express the most unlikely deliverance, by the exertion of Almighty power.

The following instance will support both these observations; and shew, that the Doctrine was unknown; and that the Image was of more force for its being unknown. The Prophet Ezekiel,† when the state of things was most desperate, is carried, by the Spirit, into a valley full of dry bones, and asked this question, *Son of man, Can these dry bones live?* A question which God would hardly have made to a Prophet brought up in the knowledge and belief of a Resurrection. But supposing the question had been made; the answer by men so brought up, must needs have been, without hesitation, in the affirmative. But we find the Prophet altogether surprized at the strangeness of the demand. He was drawn one way by the apparent impossibility of it to natural conceptions; he was drawn the other, by his belief in the Omnipotence of God. Divided between these two sentiments, he makes the only answer which a man in such circumstances could make, *O Lord God thou knowest.*‡ This surprizing act of Omnipotency is therefore shewn in Vision, either real or imaginary. The bones come together; they are cloathed with flesh, and receive the *breath of life.*§ And then God declares the meaning of the representation. "Then he said unto me, Son of Man, these bones are the whole house of Israel: Behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost, we are cut off for our

* Isai. xxix. 3, 4. † Ezek. xxxvii. ‡ Verse 3. § Verses 8, 10.

parts. Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my People, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my People, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live; and I shall place you in your own Land. Then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it, and performed it, saith the Lord."*

Here we see, in a Prophecy delivered in Action or Vision, instead of *Words* (the nature and original of which has been discoursed of elsewhere) and afterwards explained by *words*, to ascertain its meaning, that the figurative ideas of Death and Resurrection are used for temporal distresses and deliverance: and this, at a time when the *Doctrine of the Resurrection*, from whence the metaphor is supposed to arise, was so far from being well known, that the figure could never have acquired its force and energy but from the People's ignorance of such a doctrine; the scenical representation, without all question, alluding to that proverbial speech amongst the Jews: *Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise thee?*† On the whole then nothing was ever worse grounded than the observation, that *if the Scriptures speak of temporal misfortunes and deliverance in the terms of death and a resurrection, then the* DOCTRINE *of a resurrection must have been well known, or the language would have been unintelligible.*

II. And now for the general Rule which follows: *All words that are used in a figurative sense must be first understood in a literal.* If no more be meant than that every figurative sense has a literal, the proposition is true, but trifling, because *figurative* is a relative term, and implies *literal* as its correlative. If it means, that he who uses words in a figurative sense must have an *idea* of the literal, this is likewise true, but nothing to the purpose, because the *idea* of a thing does not imply either the *truth* or the *belief* of it. But if it means, that a figurative proposition implies the User's *belief* of its literal sense, this is to the purpose, but not true. The People had an *Idea* of dry bones being clothed again with flesh, and the breath of life inspired into the carcase; but they were so far from *believing* that was to be the case of all mankind, that they did not know whether it was possible that those bones in the valley could be restored.

To conclude with the ANSWERERS of this Dissertation, the miscellaneous *Writers* on the Book of Job; It may not be improper to remind them, that they would have done their duty better, and have given the learned and impartial Public more satisfaction, if, instead of labouring to evade two or three independent arguments,

* Ezek. xxxvii. 11, et seq. † Psalm lxxxviii. 10.

though corroborative of my interpretation, they had, in any reasonable manner, accounted, How this interpretation, which they affect to represent as visionary and groundless, should be able to lay open and unfold the whole conduct of the Poem upon one entire, perfect, elegant and noble plan, which does more than vulgar honour to the Writer who composed it. And that it should at the same time, be as useful in defining the Parts as in developing the Whole; so that particular texts, which, for want of sufficient light, had hitherto been an easy prey to Critics from every quarter, are now no longer affected by the common opprobrium affixed to this book, of its being a *nose of wax*, made to suit every religious System. Of which, amongst many others, may be reckoned the famous text just now explained. All this, our Hypothesis (as it is called) has been able to perform, in a Poem become, through length of time and negligence, so desperately perplexed, that Commentators have chosen, as the easier task, rather to find their own notions in it than to seek out those of the Author.

For the rest, For any fuller satisfaction, He that wants it is referred to the third chapter of the *Free and candid examination of the Bishop of London's* principles, &c.* where he will see, in a fuller light than perhaps he has been accustomed to see such matters, the great superiority of acute and solid reasoning over chicane and sophistry.

SECTION III.

THE book of JOB hath engaged me longer than I intended: but I shall make amends, by dispatching the remainder of the objections with great brevity.

Those brought from the OLD TESTAMENT are of two kinds:

I. Such as are supposed to prove the *separate* Existence, or, as it is called, the *immortality* of the Soul.

II. Such as are supposed to prove a future state of *Reward and punishment*, together with a *Resurrection* of the body.

I. To support the first point, the following words of Moses are urged,—"And God said, Let us make Man in *our image*, after our *likeness*: and let them have DOMINION, *&c.*—And God created man in *his own image*, in the *image of God* created he him:" † From whence it is inferred, that Man was created with an *immaterial soul*. On the contrary, I suppose, that Moses was here giving intimation of a very different thing, namely, its *rationality*. My reasons are these:—I think, indeed, it may be strictly demonstrated that Man's soul is *immaterial;* but then the same arguments which prove his *immateriality*, prove likewise that the souls of all living animals are *immaterial;* and this too without the least injury to Religion.‡ An

* DR. SHERLOCK. † Gen. i. 27. ‡ See DR. CLARKE against Mr. Collins on the Soul; and "The Enquiry into the Nature of the human Soul," by MR. BAXTER.

immaterial soul therefore being common to him with the whole brute creation, and it being something peculiar to man, in which the image of God is said to consist, I conclude the Historian did not here teach any thing concerning an *immaterial Soul.* The only two things peculiar to Man are his *Shape* and his *Reason.* None but an Anthropomorphite will say it was his *shape;* I conclude therefore it was his REASON: And this farther appears from hence, When God says, *Let us make man in our image, after our likeness,* he immediately adds, *And let him have* DOMINION over the whole Brute Creation: Which plainly marks in what the *image* or *likeness* consisted: for what was it that could invest man with a Dominion *de facto,* after he had it by this grant, *de jure,* but his REASON only? This dominion too was apparently given for some preeminence; but man's preeminence consists not in his having an *immaterial* soul, for that he has in common with all other animals: But in his *Reason* alone, which is peculiar to him: The *likeness* therefore or *image* consisted in REASON. And thus Philo Judæus understood the matter, where alluding to this text, he says, Λόγος ἐστὶν εἰκὼν Θεοῦ, *Reason is the image of God.* So much for the first Objection.

2. The next is drawn from the following words of the same Writer: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the *breath of life,* and man became *a living soul;*" * that is, say these Reasoners, he had an *immortal soul.* But this is only building on the strength of an English expression. Every one knows that what the translation calls a *living soul,* signifies in the original, *a living animal:* Hence the same Writer speaks of a *dead soul,*† as well as *a living soul.* And indeed not only the propriety of the terms, but the very sense of the Context requires us to confine the meaning of *living soul,* to *living animal.* GOD, the great plastic Artist, is here represented as making and shaping out a figure of earth or clay, which he afterwards animates or inspires with life. He *breathed,* says the sacred Historian, into this Statue, *the breath of life;* and the lump became a living creature. But St. Paul, I hope, may be believed whatever becomes of my explanation: who thus comments the very text in question:—*And so it is written the first man Adam was made* A LIVING SOUL, *The last was made* A QUICKENING SPIRIT.‡ Here we find the Apostle is so far from understanding any *immortality* in this account of Man's Creation, that he opposes the mortal animal ADAM, to the immortal-making Spirit of CHRIST.

3. Again, God in his sentence of condemnation denounced against all the parties concerned in Adam's transgression, says to the serpent, *I will put enmity between thee and the woman; and between thy seed*

* Gen. ii. 7. † Num. vi. 6. See also Lev. xxi. 1, 11. ‡ 1 Cor. xv. 45—49.

*and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.** It will be allowed that even the most early mortals could not be so stupid as modern infidels would make them, to understand these words in their strict literal sense, that "serpents would be apt to bite men by the heel, and men as ready to crush their heads." But to enable them to understand, by this part of the sentence, that "man should be restored to his lost inheritance of immortality by the sacrifice of Christ on the cross," needed an express revelation of this mystery. What then did the Jews understand by it? This certainly, and nothing but this, that "the evil Spirit, who actuated the Serpent, would continue his enmity to the human race; but that man, by the divine assistance, should be at length enabled to defeat all his machinations."

4. Again, the phrase used by the sacred Historian to indicate the deaths of the Patriarchs is further urged in support of the opposition.—"*He died, and was gathered to his People.*† And *dying* is expressed by *going down into the grave,* or into *Hell,* SCHEOL.—*I will go down into the grave* (says Jacob) [or into *Hell*] *to my son mourning:* ‡ which phrases are supposed to intimate the soul's surviving the body, and retiring, on the dissolution of the union, to one common Receptacle of Souls: for that it is not only said, the man *died and was buried,* but likewise that he *was gathered to his fathers:* And Jacob said, he *would go down into the grave to his son,* who was supposed to have been devoured by wild beasts." But 1. The Objectors do not reflect on the genius of the Eastern speech, which gives action and motion to every thing; in which to be reduced to one common lot or condition is called being *gathered to their People;* in this sense Jacob might properly say, he would go down to the grave to a dead son, who was never buried, *i. e.* that he should find no ease to his sorrows till he was reduced to the same condition. 2. The Objectors forget too the peculiar genius of the Hebrew tongue, that delights so much in Pleonasms; in which *to die,* and *to be gathered to their people,* are but two different phrases for the same thing. At the same time, I am ready to allow that this latter phrase originally arose (whatever People first employed it) from the notion of some common Receptacle of Souls. But we know how soon, and from what various causes, *terms* and *phrases* lose the memory of their original. 3. The truth of this interpretation is confirmed by the several contexts, where all these expressions occur; the Historian's purpose being evidently nothing else than to record the period of their existence here on earth.

These (except such as have been considered elsewhere) are all the

* Gen. iii. 15. † Gen. xxv. 8, 17; xxxv. 29; xlix. 29, 33; Num. xx. 24, 26, 28; xxvii. 13. ‡ Gen. xxxvii. 35.

texts I can find objected to my position, that *immortality* was not taught by the LAW. How little they are to the purpose is now seen. But little or much, the Reader will remember they make nothing against my general argument, which maintains that the early Jews, (those of them, I mean, and they certainly were but few, who thought any thing of the matter) had at least some vague notion of the Soul's surviving the body. But the particular reason I had to examine them hath been given above.

II. We come next to those SCRIPTURES which are urged to prove, that *a future state of reward and punishment*, or a *resurrection of the body*, was taught by the Mosaic Law. But before we proceed to the particular texts, it will be proper to consider the general argument brought from the genius of the whole Jewish Law: "which, as they say, being entirely TYPICAL, or, as the Apostle says, SPIRITUAL, all the promises and denunciations of temporal good and evil, did denote and obumbrate a future state of reward and punishment; for that it was *a shadow of things to come, but that the body was of* CHRIST." * If the Objectors mean by this, that the sanction of Temporal reward and punishment was no more than a mere representation, in figurative expressions, of the Doctrine of a *future state*, without any real meaning in the then Providential disposition of the things of this life: † If, I say, this be their meaning, the whole pretence to Moses's divine Mission is irrecoverably given up. Not to say, that the very *pretence* would be as absurd as it was false. For a THEOCRACY (from whence flowed temporal rewards and punishments) was no figurative expression, as appears from the real and substantial Laws made in support of the Thing. In a word, it is a vile and impious imagination, originally conceived by certain *Jewish* Allegorists after the *extraordinary Providence* was departed from them: and only to be matched by a like madness in certain *Mahometan* Allegorists, whose early successes made them fancy this *extraordinary Providence* was come to them; and therefore supposed, on the other hand, that Hell and Paradise in the *Alcoran* mean no more than the pleasures and afflictions of this life.‡ In which, Both have been outdone by a late Madman of our own, in his Discourses on the Gospel-Miracles. So odly perverse is the human understanding when it has once forsaken the road of common sense.

But if by the Law's being TYPICAL or SPIRITUAL, no more be meant (as I think no sober man can mean more) than that the TEMPORAL REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, equally and *really* distributed,

* Col. ii. 17. † See note FF, at the end of this book. ‡ "Il y a parmi les sectateurs d'Ali, une secte qui prend son nom d'un Docteur nommé Alkhatthab, lequel a enseigné que les delices du Paradis et les peines de l'Enfer ne sont autre chose que les plaisirs et les afflictions de la vie."—HERBELOT, *Bibl. Orientale*, Mot AKHRAT, et AKHRET.

and the RITUAL WORSHIP, daily performed, were typical or significative of the GOSPEL DISPENSATION, and of the *life and immortality* which that Dispensation *brought to light*, I acknowledge it for a truth: And, what is more, I require nothing farther to prove my Proposition, *That a future state of rewards and punishments was not taught to the Jewish People by their Law.* The Objectors suppose, as I do, that the Jewish and Christian Religions are two parts of one entire Dispensation. St. Paul tells us the order of these two parts, THAT WAS NOT FIRST WHICH IS SPIRITUAL, BUT THAT WHICH IS NATURAL; AFTERWARDS THAT WHICH IS SPIRITUAL.* Yet, at the same time, he tells us, THE LAW IS SPIRITUAL.† How is this to be reconciled? No otherwise than thus, That the Law was TYPICAL of the future spiritual part of the one entire Dispensation.—Again, The Apostles, in order to shew the superior excellence of the GOSPEL, in their reasoning against Jews and Judaizing Christians, set the LAW in opposition to it, under the titles of *The law of a carnal Commandment; The ministration of Death; The Law of Works:* and call subjection to it, *Subjection to the Flesh.* Yet these very Writers at the same time own that *the Law was* SPIRITUAL, or had a spiritual meaning. But if by this they would teach that the spiritual meaning was generally understood *under the Law*, their whole argument had concluded in a self-contradiction. For then it was not a *Law of a carnal commandment, a ministration of death;* but, indeed, *a Law of spirit, a ministration of life;* only under a dead and carnal cover; which being clearly seen through, or easily taken off, served for no more than a trick of *hocus pocus.* The consequence of all this would be, that the LAW was of equal dignity, and, though not of equal simplicity, yet, indeed, essentially the same with the GOSPEL. They owned, we see, that the *Law* had a *spiritual sense:* but when, and by whom discovered, the Apostle Paul informs us, by calling that sense the NEWNESS OF SPIRIT;‡ which he opposes to *the oldness of the letter*, that is, the *letter of the Law.* In the former part of the verse, he speaks of the *Law being dead;* and, here, of its being *revived* with a *new spirit*, in contradistinction to the *oldness of the letter.* So true was it, what in another place he observes, that *the Law was a* SHADOW *of things to come; but the* BODY *was of Christ.*§ The *shadow* not of a *body* then to be seen or understood, as these Answerers imagine, but of a *body that was to come*, and, by its presence, to explain the meaning and reason of the *shadow.* For the Jews being, as the Apostle says, *in bondage under the elements of the world*,‖ were as men shut up in prison, with their faces kept turned

* 1 Cor. xv. 46. † Rom. vii. 14. ‡ Verse 6. § Col. ii. 17. ‖ Gal. iv. 3.

from the light, towards the whited wall of CEREMONIES: on which indeed they saw many *shadows;* but the *body* or opposite substance at their backs, to which they could not turn, they saw not. And, in this state, says the same Apostle, they were *kept shut up unto the Faith, which should afterwards be revealed.** Therefore till that time came, it appears that the great community of the Jews had no knowledge of this *Faith;* one of the essential articles of which is *life everlasting.* This, we must needs have concluded even though he had not said, that till that time came, they *were in bondage under the elements of the world.* A proper character truly of a People acquainted with the revealed Doctrine of *life and immortality.* But the Objectors pretend that the reason why Moses did not PLAINLY teach a future state, in the manner CHRIST hath taught it, was because the Jews were a carnal people, incapable of *spiritual things.* Now what is the consequence of this incapacity, but that the *spiritual* sense was reserved for better times, when their minds should grow more pure and defecated from carnal things; which all along continued so gross and bounded that even the most easy of their typical informations, the *calling in of the Gentiles,* was never understood by them; yet this truth the Prophets had, from time to time, so plainly cultivated, that the vail of typical embroidery seems often to have been drawn aside, to assist their weak sight. But farther, The better part of the Objectors, I suppose, will allow that *temporal* good and evil were not only proposed, but *actually dispensed* to the Jews, living for some time under an equal Providence. And what was the consequence of this but to *confine* them to the *literal sense* of their Sanction, and stop them from looking farther? Yet in defiance of Reason, of Scripture, of the order of things, nay even of their own systems, these men will suppose, because the LAW is said to *be spiritual,* or to have a spiritual sense, that therefore this sense always went along with, and was inseparably attached to, the *literal,* in the understandings of the Jewish People. Which is so strangely absurd, that it takes away the very cause and occasion of *two senses.* For, Why, let me ask, had the Law a spiritual sense, under a *carnal cover,* but for this reason, that the first Jews were so grosly minded as to be incapable of spiritual things; and were therefore, in order to direct and govern their affections, presented with the *carnal,* to repose upon? That *Schoolmaster,* as St. Paul calls the LAW, which was to bring them by degrees, through those carnal elements, to the spiritual and sublime Doctrines of CHRIST.—Yet see the scheme of these Objectors. The early Jews are supposed of so sordid a taste as to be incapable of a spiritual Repast, and therefore they had a carnal Cover

* Gal. iii. 23.

laid before them: yet were they, at the same time, so quick scented as to pierce through this carnal shell to which they were attached, into the spiritual substance, for which they had no relish.

This may be *Reason*, say these men; but what is human *Reason* when opposed to Scripture? Just what it was, say I, before you set them at variance: and apparently for no other purpose than to silence and disgrace this modest Handmaid of *Revelation*.

However, Scripture, it seems, informs us that the figurative and literal, the spiritual and carnal senses of the Law always went together. This, they say, the Author of the epistle to the Hebrews plainly teaches.—*There are Priests who offer gifts according to the Law; who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the Tabernacle. For see* (saith he) *that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed thee in the mount.** But these words will never do the business. Could the Objectors, indeed, find a Text which tells us, that "as Moses was admonished of GOD about the spiritual sense of the Law, so he informed the People of it," this would be to the purpose. As it is, it will hardly follow, that because Moses was admonished of the spiritual sense, that therefore the spiritual and a carnal went together in the Intellects and Worship of the People. Moses's knowledge of this secret I allow, as it seems to follow from the privilege of his Mission; for if *Abraham desired to see Christ's day, and saw it, and was glad*, we are not to suppose that Moses, who had a higher office in the ministry of God's Dispensations than Abraham had, should be less favoured than Abraham was. Yet though I believe this, the text here urged in support of it, does in strictness, prove little of the matter. The Objectors suppose the sense of the text to be this.—"that *the Priests served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things*, and that of this truth, *Moses was admonished*, by God in the mount." But the Apostle is here instructing us in a very different truth. The words—*as Moses was admonished of God*—are a Similitude or Comparison which conveys a sense to this purpose,—"The Priests, who offer gifts according to the Law, serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, in as exact and close a manner as that Tabernacle, which Moses was admonished to make, answered to the pattern shewed him of it, in the mount." Not only the argument which the Apostle is upon, but the propriety of the word Χρηματίζω points us to this sense: which signifies to command or direct the doing of a thing by an Oracle or Magistrate; and this Χρηματισμὸς or direction we find in the place which the sacred writer refers to—*And look that thou make them after this pattern, which was shewed thee in the mount.*† But there is nothing these men will not employ for the

* Heb. viii. 4, 5. † Exod. xxv. 40.

support of their absurdities. They will borrow aid even from a quibble or equivocation: And the following words of the same Apostle have been urged to prove that the Law taught its Followers the doctrines of the Gospel.— *Unto us* [Christians] *was the* GOSPEL *preached as well as unto them* [Jews.]*

1. And now to proceed to the particular Texts produced from the PENTATEUCH, in support of this opinion, God says to Abraham, *In thee, shall all the families of the earth be blessed.*† The Jews understood this to signify a *formulary,* that men should use, when they invocated the choicest blessings on their friends and families, to this effect; *May God bless thee as he blessed Abraham.* And the first of Christian Interpreters, Hugo Grotius, understands it to signify a promised blessing, which, in time, should be derived to the whole earth, from Abraham's care that his posterity should continue in the belief and worship of the *one true God.* Indeed, when the fulness of time came, it would then be seen, both by Jews and Christians, that this blessing ultimately centred in the holy Jesus, the only begotten Son of God, to whom the Father hath delegated all power and dominion. Again, "GOD says to ABRAHAM, *I am thy exceeding great reward.*" ‡ And again:—"I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an *everlasting covenant;* to be a God *unto thee* and to thy seed after thee. And I will give *unto thee,* and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." § "He repeats the same promise to Isaac and to Jacob *personally;* yet he gave Abraham no inheritance in the land though he promised he would give it to him and to his seed after him."— Thus have these texts been urged by an excellent Writer ‖ against the *Sadducean* opinion, as containing a promise of future rewards in another life: But urged by him, I will suppose, as proving such a *promise* in a *secondary* or *spiritual* sense only. Because that sense is sufficient for his purpose: and because in that sense only, is it true, that they do contain such a promise. For, 1. in the *literal* sense it is a promise of the land of Canaan to Abraham and to his posterity; and in this sense it was literally fulfilled, though Abraham was never *personally* in possession of it: since Abraham and his posterity, put collectively, signify the RACE OF ABRAHAM; and that Race possessed the land of Canaan. And surely, God may be allowed to explain his own promise: Now though he tells Abraham, he would give HIM the land, yet, at the same time, he assures him that it would be many hundred years before his POSTERITY should be put into possession of it; for

* Heb. iv. 2. † Gen. xii. 3. ‡ Gen. xv. 1. § Gen. xvii. 7, 8.
‖ Dr. S. Clarke, in his "Evidence of Natural and Revealed Religion," p. 241, sixth edition.

when Abraham desired to know whereby he might be certain that he, i. e. his *seed*, should inherit the land of Canaan,* he is ordered to offer a sacrifice; after which, GOD in a vision explains to him the import of his promise: That *his seed should be a stranger in the land that was not theirs, and should serve them, and that they should afflict them four hundred years: that afterwards they should come out with great substance, and in the fourth generation should come into* CANAAN, *for that the iniquity of the Ammonites was not yet full.*† And as concerning himself, that *he should go to his fathers in peace, and should be buried in a good old age.*‡ Thus we see, that both what GOD explained to be his meaning, and what Abraham understood him to mean, was, that his Posterity, after a certain time, should be led into possession of the Land. And lest any mistake should remain concerning the accomplishment of this promise, the sacred Historian sums up the relation in these words: *In that same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying,* UNTO THY SEED HAVE I GIVEN *this land.*§ But had the Historian omitted so minute an explanation of the promise, yet common sense would instruct us how to understand it. A whole Country is given to Abraham and to his seed. Could it possibly be GOD's design, who does nothing in vain, to place his Family in the land of Canaan, till they were numerous enough to occupy and defend it? His Posterity was his Representative: and therefore the putting them into possession was the putting him into it. Not to say, that where a Grant is made to a body of men collectively, as to a People or a Family, no laws of contract ever understood the performance to consist in every individual's being a *personal* partaker. 2. Secondly, the giving an *heavenly* Canaan to Abraham could not be the literal sense of the text, because an *earthly* Canaan is owned to be the direct immediate subject of the promise. The JEWS indeed contend for this literal sense, and with some shew of reason; for they hold, that the *future state* at the Resurrection will be passed in the land of Judea, where Abraham, they say, is then to rise and take possession.‖ This is consistent however. But these CHRISTIAN Objectors, who hold no such opinion, must be content at last to find a *future state* only in the *spiritual* sense of the words: and that sense, we are by no means ambitious of taking from them.

2. "The days of the years of my pilgrimage," (says JACOB to Pharaoh) "are an hundred and thirty years: few and evil have the days of the years of my life been, and have not attained unto the days of the

* Gen. xv. 8. † Verse 13, et seq. ‡ Verse 15. § Verse 18.
‖ "Deus Abrahamo loquens ait: Dabo tibi, et semini tuo post te, terram peregrinationis tuæ. Atqui constat, Abrahamum, et reliquos Patriarchas eam terram non possedisse: necesse ergo est, ut resuscitentur, quo bonis promissis fruantur; alioqui promissa Dei irrita et falsa forent. Hinc itaque non tantum ANIMÆ IMMORTALITAS probatur, sed etiam *essentiale fundamentum legis*, RESURRECTIO scilicet MORTUORUM." —MANASSEH BEN-ISRAEL *De Resurrectione Mort.* p. 7.

years of the life of my fathers in the days of their pilgrimage."*— From this speech it is concluded, that Moses taught a *future state:* and, especially since the Author of the epistle to the Hebrews hath brought † it as a proof that Jacob and the Patriarchs looked for a *better country.* That Jacob did so, is unquestionable: but it can never be allowed that the words, in their *literal* and obvious meaning, express any such thing. Pharaoh is here questioning the Patriarch, not of human life in general, but of his own. Therefore, to make the reply pertinent, Jacob must be understood to mean by *his pilgrimage,* the unsettled way of life, living in tents, and removing from place to place, as the convenience of pasturage gave him invitation: and, by the *evil of his days,* the straits he suffered from the fraud of Laban, and the hatred of his brother Esau. As for the complaint of the *fewness of his days,* he himself explains it to be, not on account of the shortness of human life in general, but, because he *had not attained unto the days of the years of the life of his fathers.* The sense therefore, which the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews puts upon these words, must needs be the *spiritual* sense.

3. The same Patriarch, in his last benediction of his sons, breaks in upon the prophetic blessings with this pious ejaculation, *I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord:*‡ which is supposed to respect the salvation of mankind by JESUS CHRIST. I grant it doth so in a *spiritual* sense; nay, for aught I know, it may in a *literal.* But how should an early Jewish Reader understand it in this sense, when the same terms of the *salvation of God,* or of the Lord, are perpetually employed, throughout the whole Bible, to signify God's temporal mercies to the Patriarchs and their Posterity: and when now, that the Mystery of the Gospel hath been so long revealed, Christian Commentators understand it in an hundred different senses?

4. BALAAM, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, says: *Let me die the death of the Righteous, and let my last end be like his:*§ Which is understood as a wish that he might be partaker with the Righteous in another life. Had the apostate Prophet said, *Let me live the life of the Righteous,* it would have had a much fairer claim for such a meaning. As it is, Both the force of the words, and their relation to the context, restrain us to this literal meaning,—"Let me die in a mature old age, after a life of health and peace, with all my posterity flourishing about me: as was the lot of the righteous observers of the LAW." This vain wish, Moses, I suppose, recorded, that the subsequent account of his immature death in battle‖ might make the stronger impression on the serious Reader, to warn him against the impiety and folly of expecting the last reward of virtue

* Gen. xlvii. 9. † Heb. xi. 13, 14. ‡ Gen. xlix. 18. § Num. xxiii. 10. ‖ Num. xxxi. 8.

for a life spent in the gratification of every corrupt appetite. But if any one will say, the words have, besides, a sublimer meaning, I have no reason to contend with him.

5. The next is a stricture of the LAW in Leviticus, urged by Dr. Stebbing in this manner, "Moses inforces the obedience of the Israelites upon this consideration, *Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and judgments, which if a man do he shall live in them.** Here is a promise of life made to those who should observe the statutes and judgments which God gave them by his servant Moses; which cannot be understood of this temporal life only, because the best men were often cut off in the midst of their days, and frequently suffered greater adversities than the most profligate sinners. The Jews therefore have constantly believed that it had a respect to the life to come. When the lawyer in the Gospel had made that most important demand, *Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life,*† our blessed Lord refers him to what was written in the Law; and, upon his making a sound and judicious answer, approves of it; and for satisfaction to his question, tells him, *This do, and thou shalt live.*"

The Objector would have the promise of *life* in Leviticus to signify *eternal life.* But St. Paul himself had long ago decided this question, and declared for the negative. A dispute arose between him, and the judaizing Christians, concerning *what it was which justified before God,* or intitled to that eternal life brought to light by the Gospel. They held it to be the *works of the Law* (believing, perhaps, as the Objector assures us they did, that this text, in Leviticus, *had a respect to the life to come:)* St. Paul, on the contrary, affirms that it was *faith in Jesus the Messiah.* And thus he argues—"But no man is justified by the Law in the sight of God it is evident: for *the just shall live by faith.* And the law is not of faith, but the man that *doth* them shall live in them."‡ As much as to say—"That no man can obtain eternal life by virtue of the *Law* is evident from one of your own Prophets [Hab.] who expressly holds, that *the just shall* LIVE *by* FAITH.§ Now, by the *Law,* no rewards are promised to *faith,* but to *works only. The man that* DOTH *them* (says the Law in Levit.)‖ *shall live in them.*" Here then we see that this very text, which the Objector brings to prove that *eternal life was by the Law,* St. Paul urges, to prove that it *was not by the Law.* Let us attend to the Apostle's argument. He is to shew that *justification,* or eternal life, is by *faith.* This he does even on the concession of a Jew, the Prophet Habbakkuk; who expressly owns it to be by *faith.* But the Law, says the Apostle, attributes nothing to *faith;* but, to DEEDS only, *which if a man* DO *he shall live in them.* Now, if, by *life,* be here

* Lev. xviii. 5. † Luke x. 25. ‡ Gal. iii. 11, 12. § Hab. ii. 4.
‖ Lev. xviii. 5.

meant, as the objector supposes, *eternal life*, then St. Paul's argument does not come out as he intended it; namely *that faith, and not the works of the Law, justifies;* but thus, that *both faith and the works of the Law justify*, which would have satisfied these Judaizers, as reconciling on their own prejudices Moses and Habbakkuk; but would, by no means, have satisfied our Apostle; whose conclusion on this question, where discussed at large, in his Epistle to the Romans, is, *that a man is justified by faith* WITHOUT *the deeds of the Law.** The very drift of his argument therefore shews us, that he must necessarily understand the *life*, promised in this text of Leviticus, to be TEMPORAL *life only*. But charitably studious, as it were, to prevent all possible chance of our mistaking him on so important a point, He immediately subjoins, *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law.*† Now we know that our *redemption* by Christ was from that *death* which the first man brought into the world; the *curse* which he entailed upon his posterity. Therefore the transferring this term from Adam to the Law, shews plainly that in the Apostle's sentiments, the Law had no more a share in the redemption of fallen man than Adam himself had. Yet it is certain, that if the Law, when it said, *He who keeps these statutes and judgments shall live in them*, meant, *for ever*, it proposed the Redemption of mankind as compleatly as the blessed Jesus himself did, when he said, *he that believeth in me shall have everlasting life*. This becomes demonstrable, if St. Paul's reasoning will hold, who surely had heard nothing of this prerogative of the *Law*, when he said, *If there had been a* LAW *given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the Law*. Where observe, I pray you, the force of the word ζωοποιῆσαι, which signifies to *quicken*, or to *make alive;* plainly intimating the same he had said in the place quoted before, that those in subjection to the *Law* were under a *curse*, or in the state of *death*.—Let me add only this further observation, that if (as this Objector pretends) by *life* in the text of Levit. be meant *eternal life;* and if (as the Apostle pretends) by *life*, in the text of Habbakkuk, he meant *eternal life;* then will *Moses* and *Habbakkuk* be made directly to contradict one another; the first giving that *eternal life* to WORKS, which the latter gives to FAITH. But Dr. Stebbing would insinuate, that Jesus himself seems to have affixed this sense to the text in Leviticus; however, that the plain inference is that eternal life was *taught at least*, if not *obtained* by the Law. "When the lawyer in the Gospel" (says he) "had made that most important demand, *Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?*‡ our blessed Lord refers him to what was written in the Law, and upon his making a sound and judicious answer, approves of it;

* Rom. iii. 28. † Gal. iii. 13. ‡ Luke x. 25.

and for satisfaction to his question, tells him, *This do and thou shalt live.*"—Would not any one now conclude, from the sense here put upon the words of Jesus, that the *sound and judicious answer* of the Lawyer must have been a quotation of the text in Leviticus,—*Ye shall keep my statutes, which if a man do he shall live in them;*—or at least some general promise made to the observers of the whole Law of Moses? No such matter. On the contrary, the Lawyer's answer was a quotation of only one precept of the Law, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,* &c. *and thy neighbour as thy self.* Now how much soever we may differ about a *future state's* being held out by the *Law,* through a Messiah to come, I suppose we are both agreed that *faith in the Messiah,* either actual or imputed, is necessary to obtain this *future state.* There are but two ways then of understanding this text of St. Luke, neither of which is to his purpose. The first is the supposing that Jesus included *faith in himself* in this precept of *loving God with all the heart,* &c. which will appear no forced interpretation to him who holds Jesus to be really and truly God; as, I imagine, the Doctor does; and may be supported by a circumstance in the story as told by St. Matthew,* though omitted by St. Luke, which is, Jesus's saying, *that on these two commandments hang all the Law and the* PROPHETS. The second and exacter interpretation is, that Jesus spoke to a professing follower, who pretended to acknowledge his Mission, and wanted only a RULE OF LIFE. For Jesus was here preaching the Gospel to his disciples, *And a Lawyer stood up and* TEMPTED *him,* that is, on the false footing of a disciple, required a rule of life. Now in either case, this reference of Jesus to the Law must imply this, and this only, *that without righteousness and holiness no man shall see the Lord.* A point in which, I suppose, we are agreed.—But still the Doctor will say that these words of Jesus *allude* to the words of Moses. Admit they do. It will not follow, as he seems to think, that they were given to *explain* them. How many allusions are there in the New Testament to passages in the Old, accommodated to a *spiritual* sense, where the texts alluded to are seen, by all but Fanatics, to have only a *carnal?* And even in this very allusion, if it be one, we find that the promise made to the observers of the whole Law is transferred to the observance of one single precept, in the moral part of it. But let us grant him all he would have; and admit that these words of Jesus were given to explain the words of Moses. What would follow from thence, but that the promise in Leviticus had a *secondary* sense of a *spiritual* and sublimer import? Will this give any advantage to the Doctor and his Party? Surely none at all. And yet the *abuse*

* Matt. xxii. 40.

of this concession is all they have to support themselves in their determined opposition to Common sense.

6. A Law in Leviticus is delivered in these terms,—"Whoever he be of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn in Israel, that giveth any of his seed unto Molech, he shall surely be put to death."* Let me first explain the text before I shew how it is perverted. There were two cases in which the offender here described might escape punishment: Either the crime could not be legally proved, Or the Magistrate might be remiss in punishing. The divine Lawgiver obviates both: and declares that the Infanticide, in such case, shall suffer death by God's own hand in an extraordinary manner. The supplial of the first defect, is in these words,—"And I will set my face against the man, and will CUT HIM OFF FROM AMONGST HIS PEOPLE."† The supplial of the second is in these:—"And if the people of the land do any ways hide their eyes from the man, when he giveth of his seed unto Molech, and kill him not, then I will set my face against that man and against his family, and will CUT HIM OFF."‡ So much for the *sense* of the text. And now for the *nonsense* of our Interpreter, a Professor of Law and Divinity, the egregious Doctor RUTHERFORTH. This sage provision for the execution of the Law our Professor being totally unconscious of, he insists "that *cutting off from amongst his People* can only mean eternal damnation, the being consigned to a state of punishment in another life."§ He is, as I say, a dealer both in Law and Divinity; but not having yet learnt the use of his tools, he confounds Law by Theology, and depraves Theology by Law: And of this, the reader has already seen some delectable instances. But at present, to regulate a little his Law-ideas, let him turn to Exod. xii. 15. and Levit. vii. 25. and he will find that the *cutting off from Israel*, and *the cutting off from the People*, are phrases which signify only capital punishment of a civil kind. Unless he will suppose that what is there threatened for eating *leavened bread* and *prohibited fat*, is ETERNAL LIFE IN TORMENTS.

7. The PSALMIST, in a holy confidence of God's mercies, says, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in* HELL, *neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption. Thou wilt shew me the path of life; in thy presence is fulness of joy, at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore.*‖—The scope of the whole Psalm is to implore the protection of God, from this consideration, that the Psalmist himself not only stedfastly adheres to the Law of God, but is ready to give his aid and support to all those who do.—That the vengeance of God pursues idolatry, which he carefully avoids—That the *God of Israel*

* Lev. xx. 2. xvi. 10, 11. † Verse 3. ‡ Verses 4, 5. § Page 33. ‖ Psalm,

is his *portion*, and the *land of Canaan* a fair *inheritance*—That this stedfast adherence to the Lord is his confidence and peace—Then follow the words in question,—That he is sure, God *will not leave his soul in Hell*, &c. &c. that is, suffer him to fall immaturely, as was the lot of the transgressors of the Law :—And concludes, that walking in the law of God is both the highest pleasure, and strongest security. All which is expressed in terms so magnificent, as to shew, indeed, that this Psalm hath a *spiritual* as well as *literal* meaning. And that spiritual meaning St. Peter hath explained to us : * Indeed, if Dr. Stebbing's word were to be taken, the Apostle hath explained it in a manner which overthrows all our reasoning. "St. Peter" (says the Doctor) "claims this passage [Ps. xvi. 10, 11.] as relating to Christ's resurrection." † But how does he claim it? No otherwise than by giving it a *secondary sense*. Now the learned Doctor himself contends that the *secondary* sense of the Prophecies was purposely concealed and secreted from the Jewish Church: Consequently, the *Resurrection*, the very doctrine which the *secondary* sense of this text conveys, was secreted from it. But then, the Doctor says, that "in the *primary* sense David declares his expectation of a future state, not in consequence of any promise of the Law, but by faith in Jesus Christ." The result then of the Doctor's exposition is this, That the same text may serve to prove that the spiritual sense of the Law *was and was not* revealed at this time. The verse has a primary sense which reveals a future state, and a secondary sense which hides and secretes it.—But he insists much upon the following words of the text—*In thy presence is fulness of joy, and at thy right hand are pleasures for evermore.* "Expressions," says the Doctor, "much too great to describe any WORLDLY HAPPINESS." ‡—I readily confess it was no *worldly happiness* which is here described: for to be in the *presence of God* signified the same as to *appear before the Ark*, Ps. xvii. 15. and to enjoy *pleasures* there *for evermore*, the same as *dwelling in the house of the Lord for ever*, i. e. all his days, Ps. xxiii. 6. a *spiritual happiness*, sure, though enjoyed in this world.

But the texts of texts, the precious ones indeed, are those where a HELL is mentioned; as here—*thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell.* § And of this orthodox consolation there is no scarcity in the Old Testament. Mr. Whiston assures us, *it is almost five times as often mentioned as in the New.* It may be so. However, instead of examining into the justness of this nice calculation, I shall chuse rather to consider what is to be understood by the word, than how often it is repeated. Now, I suppose neither I nor my Answerers can have any reasonable objection to St. John's authority in this matter; who speaking, in the book of Revelations, of the useless old furniture of

* Acts ii. 25—29. † Exam. p. 49. ‡ Ibid. § Psalm xvi. 10.

the LAW, says—*and* DEATH *and* HELL *were cast into the* LAKE OF FIRE: *this is the second death.** From hence it appears that the HELL of the Old Testament was a very different thing from the HELL of the New, called, the *lake of Fire;* since the one is made the punishment, or at least the extinction of the other. And to remove all doubt, the Apostle, we see, calls this *casting into the lake,* a *second death.* Must not then the *Lake* itself be a *second Hell?* And if so, could the *first* or the Old Testament HELL be any other than the GRAVE? The next words tell us, *that whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.*† So that the sense of the whole seems to be this, that at the consummation of things (the subject here treated of) all physical and moral evil shall be abolished.

8. Again, The Psalmist says, "Deliver my soul from the wicked —from the men of the world—which *have their portion in this life,* and whose belly thou fillest with thy hid treasure.—As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: *I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness.*" ‡ Many moral and mystical commentators (and perhaps our English translators themselves, as one would think from the turn of their language) understood these words as literally pointing, in one verse, to a *future state,* and, in the other, to a *resurrection.* And in this, the dissenter, *Leland,* as I remember, in some of his things, seems much to triumph. But I shall shew that it means nothing less.

They have *their portion in* THIS *life,* say our translators, who, with great piety, had their heads full of ANOTHER. Whereas the original word literally signifies *in vitis,* the Hebrew being a plural word and having no singular: which, by the way, let me observe, is a convincing proof that the ideas of the common users of this language were only employed about this life; had they been conversant, like us, with another, they would soon have found a singular to their plural. This will be thought a strange Paradox by those I have to do with, who do not know that plural nouns are often words of amplification, not of number. As our translators render it, *in this life,* so the Chaldee Par. goes a step further, and renders it, *in life eternal.* The Sept. translators, who best understood their own idiom, interpret it better than either, ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτῶν, *in this life of theirs.* So that the true meaning of what we turn, *their portion of this life,* amounts to this—*they are perfectly prosperous.*

And now, concerning the words in the other verse,—*I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness.* For the sense of these I shall transcribe the following passage of an excellent Critic, and, what is more, a very orthodox Divine.—"The Chaldee," says Dr. Hammond,

* Rev. xx. 14. † Verse 15. ‡ Psalm xvii. 13—15.

(and what sort of interpreters they were we have seen just above) "apply this *awaking* to *David—when I shall awake I shall be satisfied with the glory of thy countenance.* And so it hath *truth*, in respect of the resurrection of the just.—But all the other interpreters agree to apply it to *this glory;* ἐν τῷ ὀφθῆναι τὴν δόξαν σου, *at the appearing of thy glory*, say the LXXII.—*cum apparuerit gloria tua*, says the Latin; (and so the Arabic and Æthiopic)—*When thy fidelity shall awake*, saith the Syriac: And so most probably it is to be understood. By [*God's glory awaking*] signifying his glorious and powerful interposition to David's PRESENT rescue from his enemies hands.—And thus the learned Castellio took it; 'tum satiandus, cum tua experrecta fuerit imago;' *I shall be satisfied when thy likeness shall be awaked.*" * Other Interpreters, and those of the first Class, who make the *awaking* to refer to *David*, suppose it to signify his morning adorations before the Ark, the symbolic residence of the divine Presence.† But that David was here speaking in the language of the *Law*, and not of the *Gospel*, I think, all but determined Bigots will confess.

9. And again: *Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I will dwell in the House of the Lord for ever.*‡ By the *house of the Lord* can be meant nothing else but the *Tabernacle* or the *Temple:* So that, *for ever*, or as the Heb. says, *to length of days*, must mean that mature old age, which the Law promised to its faithful adherents.

10. In the xxxvi. Psalm, the sacred Writer says: *For with thee is the fountain of life: in thy light shall we see light.*§ Here, to prove the *immortality* of Man, a text is produced, which teaches the *eternity of* GOD. But I know Some, who think there is a necessary connection between these two truths.

11. "Like sheep" (says the Psalmist) "they [the wicked] are laid in the grave, death shall feed upon them; and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning, and their beauty shall consume in the grave, from their dwelling. But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave, for he shall receive me." ‖ The literal meaning of which is, as appears by the context, that "the wicked should be untimely cut off and destroyed,—*in the morning*, that is, by the judgment of the Law, which was administered in the morning hours; ¶ but that his life, and the life of the upright, should be preserved and prolonged." Here, once for all, let me desire the

* Annot. on Psalm xvii. † "Videtur significare David arcam, quam singulis temporibus matutinis Deum adoraturus adibat."—CLERIC. in locum. "Pro more Hebr. Poeseos, ipsum in Sanctuario quotidie in præsentia Dei ad arcam, quod divinæ præsentiæ symbolum erat, sese velle sistere, quod illi ante omnia in votis fuit, summoque gaudio perfudit."—HARE in loc. ‡ Psalm xxiii. 6. § Psalm xxxvi. 9. ‖ Psalm xlix. 14, 15. ¶ See Jer. xxi. 12. "O house of David, thus saith the Lord, *Execute judgment* IN THE MORNING, and deliver him that is spoiled, out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire,—because of the evil of your doings."

Objectors to consider, What it is that is ever opposed (in the many passages of this sort) to *Life, Redemption,* &c. It is not *Misery, Torments,* &c. as it must have been, did *life* literally signify eternal life in a future state; but it is DEATH, which shews it was a *life here on earth.*

12. *Thou shalt guide me* (says he again) *with thy counsel, and afterwards receive me to glory.** Or, as an excellent Critic has it, *Consilio tuo deduxisti me, et postea cum gloria excepisti me.* "Thou wast, or shalt be, always present with me in difficulties and distresses; and shalt lead and conduct me to better fortunes." This literal sense the context requires.

13. "But the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting, upon them that fear him, and his righteousness unto childrens children; to such as keep his covenant, and to those that remember his commandments to do them."† This is so far from intimating a *future state,* that it is the very temporal promise annexed to the second Law of the Decalogue—*Shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.*‡

14.—*For* THERE *the Lord commanded the blessing, even life for evermore.*§—Where? In the *habitation* of *brethren living together in unity.* Nothing else then can be meant, but that death and dangers should not approach a house so strongly united in itself.

15. In the book of Proverbs it is said—"The wicked is driven away in his wickedness: BUT THE RIGHTEOUS HATH HOPE IN HIS DEATH."‖ That is, "the righteous hath hope that he shall be delivered from the most imminent dangers." So the Psalmist—*upon them that hope in his mercy; to deliver their soul from death, and to keep them alive in famine.*¶—And again, *Thou hast delivered my soul from death; Wilt not thou deliver my feet from falling, that I may walk before God in the light of the living?* ** See Ps. xxxiii. 19. lvi. 13.

16. And again— *The way of life is above to the wise, that he may depart from Hell beneath.*†† That is, The wise man prolongs his days here on earth, and escapes that untimely death which attends vice and folly. A Doctrine perpetually inculcated throughout this book; as at chap. x. ver. 2, 28. chap. xi. ver. 7. chap. xii. ver. 28. chap. xxi. ver. 16.

And again, "When a wicked man dieth, his EXPECTATION shall perish; and the hope of unjust men perisheth."‡‡ And again,—"So shall the knowledge of wisdom be unto thy soul: when thou hast found it; then there shall be a reward, and thy EXPECTATION shall not be cut off."§§ In the first of these two places it appears by the

* Psalm lxxiii. 24. † Psalm ciii. 17, 18. ‡ Exod. xx. 6. § Psalm cxxxiii. 3. ‖ Prov. xiv. 32. ¶ Psalm xxxiii. 18, 19. ** Psalm lvi. 13. †† Prov. xv. 24. ‡‡ Prov. xi. 7. §§ Prov. xxiv. 14.

context (that is, by the whole tenor of these moral precepts and aphorisms) that the *expectation which should deceive* is that of worldly wicked men to establish a house in their posterity: And in the second, the *expectation which should not deceive* is that of wise and virtuous men in the success of their honest endeavours. But there is one common fallacy which runs through all the reasoning of these Anticritics: it is this, that having taken the point in question [whether a future state be taught in the Old Testament] for granted, they confine all expressions, capable of either sense considered alone, to the sense which supports their own opinion. Whereas, while the matter is in question, fair reasoning requires, that such Texts be considered as indifferent to either sense, till determined by the Context, and according to the Analogy of the *Law and the Prophets.*

17. We conclude with the PREACHER, who says, that *Wisdom giveth life to them that have it:** And so says the Law of Moses likewise (which is here alluded to) and yet it gives nothing but the things of *this life.*

18. Again: "Though a sinner do evil an hundred times, and his days be prolonged, yet surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear GOD."† What is meant by this, the very following words declare: *But it shall not be well with the wicked, neither shall he prolong his days, which are as a shadow: because he feareth not before God.*‡—That is, though the wicked be suffered to go on for some time, yet for all that, Vengeance shall overtake and arrest him in the middle of his course.§

19. And again—"Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth, and let thy heart chear thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thy heart, and in the sight of thine eyes: but know thou, that for all these things, God will bring thee into judgment. Therefore remove sorrow from thy heart, and put away evil from thy flesh, for childhood and youth are vanity."‖ That is, "in giving an innocent and lawful indulgence to thy Youth, take heed lest thou transgress the bounds of virtue and piety. For know, that GOD will certainly punish thy offences, either in thy own Person, or in thy Posterity."

These are all the passages of moment (till we come to the PROPHETS) which I could find have been objected to the Opinion, *That a future state of reward and punishment is not in the Mosaic Dispensation.* By which it appears, that the Objectors have been very inattentive to what an Interpreter of the Old Testament should have his thoughts constantly attached, namely to these three things; to the CONTEXT; to the genius of the EASTERN STYLE; and to the Œconomy under which the early Hebrews lived, that is to say, an

* Eccles. vii. 12. † Eccles. viii. 12. ‡ Verse 13. § See note GG, at the end of this book. ‖ Eccles. xi. 9, et seq.

EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE. But this last fault, though the most inexcusable of all, they all have in common with the late Jewish Writers; who, considering only the Dispensation under which themselves lived, thought it harsh and unnatural to interpret these Texts with reference to worldly good and evil which they saw unequally distributed.

On the whole therefore it appears, that all these passages, in their obvious and *primary* sense, relate to the *things of this life;* and that some of them are expressed by the Holy Spirit in such a manner, as makes it now evident, they had likewise a *spiritual* and sublimer meaning, and do indeed refer to the completion of the Law, by the Gospel.

The Texts here examined are urged in common both by Jews and Christians. But, besides these, the Jews have a set of Texts peculiar to themselves; which the Christians have never yet ventured to put upon Duty. As they are most of them of the nature of *Riddles,* Riddles, for me, they shall remain: only, for the curious Reader's satisfaction, I shall mark out what the Rabbins bring from the PENTATEUCH to prove the *immortality of the soul, and the resurrection of the body,* as they are collected by the learned Manasseh Ben-Israel, in his tract *De Resurrectione Mortuorum.* For the IMMORTALITY, 1 Kings i. 31. Psalm cxvi. 7, 8, 9. Exod. xix. 6. chap. xxxiii. ver. 20. Levit. vii. 25. Deut. xiv. 1, 2. chap. xxii. ver. 7. chap. xxxii. ver. 47.—For the RESURRECTION, Gen. iii. 19. chap. xxxvii. ver. 10. Exod xv. 6. Levit. xxv. Numb. xv. 30. chap. xviii. ver. 28. Deut. iv. 4. chap. xxxii. ver. 39. chap. xxxiii. ver. 6. But though the reader will find many diverting things on this head in Manasseh Ben-Israel, yet they must all give place to the curious comment of Rabbi Tanchum on the following words of 1 Sam. xxv. 29. *The soul of my Lord shall be bound in the bundle of life with the* LORD *thy* GOD: *and the souls of thine enemies, them shall he sling out, as out of the middle of a sling.* "Sententia est omnium Interpretum" (says this profound Rabbi) "quod ad hunc textum, esse ipsum per modum commonitionis [quâ declaratur] quisnam futurus sit animæ status, et ad quid tandem deventura sit, postquam à corpore separata fuerit; atque ostendere *duplicem* esse ipsi statum, viz. quibusdam animabus esse gradum sublimem et locum stabilem, apud Dominum suum, dum vitâ immortali fruantur, nec morti nec perditioni obnoxiæ: aliis autem ludere fluctus naturæ, adeo ut requiem et consistendi locum non inveniant, verum *dolores perpetuos* et *cruciatus continuos,* cum *æterna duratione,* instar lapidis, qui è fundâ projectus circumrotatur in aëre pro ratione virium jacientis, dein vi sua naturali gravitate in terram decidit. Animæ vero nec inest gravitas quæ ipsam deorsum, nec levitas quæ sursum ferat; ideoque in perpetua est confusione, perturbatione,

tristitia, et dolore usque *in æternum*. Atque hæc reverâ sententia est SAPIENTUM et PHILOSOPHORUM."—How profound a Doctrine! and how noble an original! But this is not the first, by a thousand, which has been raised from a Metaphor, out of the hot-bed of theologic *wisdom and philosophy*. An abuse, that some cooler thinkers of late have fancied they could never get well rid of, till they had turned the few *Doctrines* of true Christianity back again into *Metaphors*. And they have succeeded to admiration.

SECTION IV.

WE come at length to the texts of the NEW TESTAMENT, which are urged to prove, against itself, that *Life and Immortality was brought to light* by the OLD.

I. The first is that famous argument of JESUS against the Sadducees:—*Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.—But as touching the Resurrection of the dead, Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.** Now this very Text, had it been impartially considered, would alone have been sufficient to convince these Answerers of the truth here contended for. At least it convinced a much wiser man, the excellent HUGO GROTIUS, whose words to his friend Ger. Vossius are as follow: "In Mosis lege (non dico in veteri Testamento: nam de Prophetis, præsertim posterioribus, res longe alia est) æternæ vitæ non fieri mentionem nisi per umbras, aut rationis consequentiam, certissimum mihi videtur, Christi autoritate, qui Sadducæos *non verbis directis, sed ratiocinando* refellit."† There is not, I repeat it, any plain Text in the whole Bible (and this is amongst the plainest) so strangely mistaken and perverted: For, 1. The appellation of *the* GOD *of Abraham, &c.* is generally understood to be quoted by our blessed Lord, as a direct proof‡ of the *Resurrection of the dead body*,

* Matt. xxii. 29, 31, 32. † Ep. 130, ed. Am. 1687. EPISCOPIUS had the very same idea of this argument.—"Et sane opinionum, quæ inter Judæos erat, circa vitam futuri sæculi discrepantia arguit promissiones Lege factas tales esse ut ex iis certi quid de vita futuri sæculi non possit colligi. Quod et Servator noster non obscure innuit, cum resurrectionem mortuorum colligit, *Matt.* xxii. non ex promisso aliquo Legi addito, sed ex generali tantum illo promisso Dei, quo se Deum Abrahami, Isaaci, et Jacobi futurum spoponderat: quæ tamen illa collectio magis nititur cognitione intentionis divinæ sub generalibus istis verbis occultatæ aut comprehensæ, de qua Christo certo constabat, quam necessaria consequentia sive verborum vi ac virtute manifestâ, qualis nunc et in verbis Novi Testamenti, ubi vita æterna et resurrectio mortuorum proram et puppim faciunt totius Religionis Christianæ, et tam clare ac diserte promittuntur ut ne hiscere quidem contra quis possit."—*Institut. Theol.* lib. iii. § 1, cap. 2. ‡ Mr. Le Clerc, in his *Defense des Sentimens sur l'Histoire Critique*, has fallen into this mistake:—"Nôtre Seigneur presse ces termes, en sorte qu'il suppose qu'il ne faut qu'entendre la langue dans laquelle l'Ecriture parle pour *reconnoitre la Resurrection*, Matt. xxii. 31.—Il ne faut que lire ce raisonnement de Jesus Christ, pour sentir qu'il est tiré de cette expression, *être le Dieu de quelqu'un*, que l'on ne pourroit appliquer à Dieu, si celui, dont on dit qu'il est le Dieu, etoit *mort sans devoir jamais resusciter*."—Pp. 102, 103.

in the same manner that St. Paul urges the case of JESUS:—*but now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept.** But can any thing be more irrational or absurd? The bodies of Abraham and the Patriarchs were yet in dust, and reduced to their primitive earth. So that in this sense, the reasoning is so far from proving *that God* WAS NOT *the God of the dead,* that it proves, *he was.* For Abraham's body continued yet lifeless at the very time when God was called his *God:* Whatsoever was to be the future condition of it, that could not influence the present appellation of the God of Israel. What hath led men into this mistake is the introduction to the argument,—*But as touching the resurrection of the dead,*—which they supposed an exordium to a *direct* proof: Whereas it is an intimation only, to what an *indirect* proof tended; namely, that the *Resurrection of the body* might be inferred through the medium of the *separate existence of the soul;* which was the only point Jesus proposed to prove *directly* to them. The case stood thus: He was here arguing against the SADDUCEES. Now these supported their opinion, of *no resurrection of the body,* on a principle that *the soul had no separate existence,* but fell into nothing at the dissolution of its union with the body; which Principle once overthrown, they had nothing left to oppose to the writings of the Prophets, or the preaching of JESUS. Against this principle therefore our blessed Lord thus divinely argues:—"But as concerning the Resurrection of the dead, You ground your denial of it on this supposition, that the soul dies with the body; but you err as much in not knowing the Scriptures, as in not rightly conceiving of the power of God. For the words of the Law, which you allow to be a good authority, directly prove that the soul doth not die with the body, but hath a separate existence. Now Moses tells us, that God, long after the death of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, called himself *their God:* But God *is not the God of the dead, but of the living;* therefore the souls of those Patriarchs are yet existing in a separate state."—This is the force of the argument.†

2. The second mistake is, that JESUS, by these words, insinuates that Moses CULTIVATED the Doctrine of a *Resurrection,* or a *Future state.* But here again the Objectors seem to forget, against whom the argument is addressed, the SADDUCEES. Now these not only held that Moses did *not teach,* but that he did NOT BELIEVE that Doctrine. This was the error JESUS aimed to confute; and only this; because the opinion that Moses did not *teach* or *cultivate* it, was no error at all, as appears, amongst many other reasons, even from hence: that the Jews might reasonably understand the title of the *God of Abraham, &c.* to mean the peculiar tutelary God of Abraham's Family;

* 1 Cor. xv. 20. † See note HH, at the end of this book.

for the terms *Jacob* and *Israel* are frequently used in Scripture for the whole nation of the Jews; *Aaron* for the whole order of the priesthood; *Dan, Judah, &c.* for the whole body of each tribe: And, as in reason they *might*, so by the History of the early Jews, we find in fact, they *did* understand it in this sense.

The real force therefore of the Text, here urged, amounts to this, From JESUS's argument it appears, that the separate existence of the soul might be fairly inferred from the writings of Moses: Which inference I not only grant some early Jews did make, but have proved likewise; though not indeed from these words, for the reason given above. And so much my Answerers might have understood, had they only observed that this has all the marks of a new Argument,* unknown to the Pharisees; as indeed both the dignity of our Lord's character, and the impression he would make on his Opposers, seemed to require it should be. Accordingly we find they are struck dumb; and *the multitude that heard this, astonished at his doctrine.*† But would Either of them have been so affected with an old foundered argument, long hacknied in the Schools and Synagogues‡ of the Pharisees? Nay, how should it be otherwise than NEW? for the words, *I am the God of Abraham*, &c. as delivered by Moses, were supposed, both by Pharisees and Sadducees, to be spoken of a NATIONAL GOD; as in Gen. xvii. 8, 9. xxvi. 3. xxviii. 13. They therefore could not see how it implied the continued existence of the Patriarch Abraham, &c. But Jesus, in using the word GOD, to signify the Maker and Lord of all things, rightly inferred that the Patriarchs still continued to exist. I am not ignorant, that the modern Rabbins employed this argument very familiarly for a *Resurrection;* but they borrowed it from the GOSPEL, as they have done many other things; the reason of which, our rabbinical Commentators, such as Lightfoot, not apprehending, have supposed the *borrowing* to be all on the side of the lenders: but more of this matter in its place.

Thus much for this celebrated Text. In which, however, the learned Dr. Sherlock, the late Bishop of London, finds enough to support himself in his own opinion, *That the Law of Moses afforded a good proof of a future state to the ancient Jews.*§ But to whom did it afford this proof? To the ancient Jews, who understood the words in the text, in question, to relate to a *national God;* or to us Christians, who understand them of the Creator of the Universe? Now though I cannot agree with his Lordship in this conclusion, yet I agree with him in a better thing, which is, *That the Law of Moses*

* See note II, at the end of this book. † Matt. xxii. 33. ‡ The learned Pocock, speaking of this Argument, says, "His e Lege depromptis cum Sadducæos ad silentium adegisset Christus, dicitur perculsam fuisse turbam doctrinâ ejus. Unde patet luculentiori ipsum contra eos argumento usum, quam ullo quo adhuc usi fuerant Pharisæi." —*Notæ miscell. ad Portam Mosis*, cap. vi. § "Sermons" by the Bishop of London.

affords a good proof of its own divinity; indeed, by a medium his Lordship never thought of, namely, *That it afforded no proof of a future state at all.* But what if his Lordship meant no more than what his respectable Father endeavoured to prove,* viz. that the EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE (which I hold to be the very circumstance which kept the Jews from the knowledge of a future state) indeed shows that they had the knowledge of it? If this be the case, all I have to say is, that Their proof of a *future state* from the LAW, begins just where my proof of its *divinity* ends.

II. We come next to the Parable of the *rich Man and Lazarus;* where the former, being in Hell, desires Abraham, whom he saw afar off in Paradise, to send Lazarus to his father's house, to testify to his Brethren, and to lead them to repentance, lest they too should come into that place of torment: To which Abraham replies: *If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.*† Hence it is inferred, that both Moses and the Prophets *taught a future state of Rewards and Punishments.* But, here again, the Objectors are quite beside the matter. As, in the former case, they would not see, the argument was directed against the SADDUCEES; so here, by as perverse a connivance, they will not reflect, that this Parable is addressed to the PHARISEES. It is certain we must judge of the drift and design of every rational discourse from the character of those to whom it is addressed. Now had this Parable been told to the Sadducees, whose grand error it was, to deny a future state of rewards and punishments; and had the rich man been represented as a Sadducee, who was too late convinced of his mistake, and wanted to undeceive his father's house, which his evil DOCTRINES had perverted; had this, I say, been the case, there might have been some ground for the Objectors' inference, which I suppose to be this, That "it appears as plainly from Moses and the Prophets, that there is a future state of rewards and punishments, as if one came back from that state to tell us so." On the contrary, the Parable was particularly addressed to the Pharisees, the great patrons of a future state, and who sedulously taught it in opposition to the Sadducees. It is introduced in this manner: *And the* PHARISEES *also, who were* COVETOUS [φιλάργυροι], *heard all these things: and they derided him.*‡ For which they are thus reproved: *Ye are they which justify yourselves before men: but God knoweth your hearts.*§ And then presently follows the Parable. Their capital errors therefore were errors of PRACTICE, *Avarice* and *Luxury.* And it was to reform these, that a *rich Pharisee* is represented as without any compassion for the poor, living in all kind of delicacy, and dying impenitent. This man,

* "Sermons" by the Dean of St. Paul's, "On the Immortality of the Soul and a Future State," p. 141. † Luke xvi. 31. ‡ Verse 14. § Verse 15.

when he comes in the other world, finds so ill a reception there, wants one to be sent to his brethren (who believed, doubtless, as he did, the *Doctrine of a future state)* to warn them of their evil ways, and to assure them, that luxury and inhumanity, unrepented of, would assuredly damn them. Which information, he thought, would be best inforced by a Miracle: *If one went unto them from the dead, they will* REPENT.* (Where observe, it is not—*they will* BELIEVE.) To this common mistake, Abraham's reply is extremely pertinent: *If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead:* i. e. "If they will not hear Moses, and the Prophets, whose authority they acknowledge,† and whose missions were confirmed by so many and well-attested Miracles, neither will they regard a new one, of the resurrection of a dead man. (Nor, in fact, were the Pharisees at all softened into repentance by the return of that Lazarus, the namesake of this in the parable, whom Jesus raised from the dead.) Now Moses and the Prophets have denounced the most severe threatenings, on the part of God, against vice and impenitence." This is the force of the argument; in which we see the question of a *future state* is no more concerned, than thus far only, that God will punish, either *here* or *hereafter*. Moses and the Prophets threatened the punishment here; and, while here it was executed, the Jews looked no farther: But when the *extraordinary* Providence, by which that punishment was administered, had ceased, the Jews began, from those very promises and denunciations, to entertain some hopes of an *hereafter*, where all inequalities should be set even, and God's threats and promises executed to the full: though still, with less confidence, if they reasoned rightly, than the Pagans had to draw the same conclusion from the same principles; since their Law had informed them of a truth unknown to the rest of mankind; namely, that the whole Race was condemned to a state of death and mortality, a return to dust from whence Man was taken, for the transgression of Adam. So that all which good logic or criticism will authorize the believers of a future state to draw from this parable, is this, "that God is a severe punisher of unrepentant luxury and inhumanity."

But now admit the mistaken interpretation of the Objectors; and what will follow! *That Moses taught a future state,* the Proposition, I oppose? No; But that from *Moses and the Prophets together* a future state might be collected. A Proposition, I have no occasion to oppose. For when the *Prophets* are joined to *Moses,* and have explained the *spiritual* meaning of his Law, and developed the hidden sense of it, I may well allow that from both together a learned Pharisee might collect the truth of the doctrine, without receding one tittle from my Argument.

* Luke xvi. 30. † See note KK, at the end of this book.

III. "When the Lawyer in the Gospel" (say these Objectors) "had made that most important Demand,* *Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life,* our blessed Lord refers him to what was *written in the Law:* and upon his giving a sound and judicious answer, approves of it, and for satisfaction to his question, tells him, *This do, and thou shalt live.*" This is the objection. And to this, Saint Paul shall give an answer.—*Is the* LAW *then* AGAINST *the promises of God? God forbid. For if there had been a Law given which could have given Life, verily righteousness should have been by the Law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin; that the promise by* FAITH *of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.*† We must therefore think that this Lawyer was better at distinctions than the Objector who brings him into his Cause, and inquired, *(in this most important demand)* of the AGENDA, not of the CREDENDA, in order to salvation. And so his words bear witness—*What shall I* DO *to be saved?*

IV. In what follows, I hardly think the Objectors can be serious.—*Search the Scriptures* (says JESUS to the Jews) *for in them* YE THINK YE HAVE *eternal life,*—ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν—*and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me that ye* MIGHT HAVE LIFE.‡ The homicide§ Jews, to whom these words are addressed, THOUGHT *they had eternal life in their Scriptures;*—THEREFORE (say the Objectors) *they had eternal Life.* If I allow this *therefore,* they must allow me, another—THEREFORE the Mission of JESUS was vain, being anticipated by that of Moses, *who brought life and immortality to light by the* LAW.—*And if righteousness came by the Law* (says the Apostle) *then is Christ dead in vain.* This is a necessary consequence from the Objectors' interpretation, and gives us, to be sure, a very high idea of the reasoning of the ever blessed JESUS.—By the same Art of inferring, I suppose too they will conclude, that, when St. Paul says to the unbelieving Jew:—*And thou art confident that thou thyself art a guide to the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, and a teacher of babes;*‖ they will conclude, I say, that THEREFORE it was the Jew, and not St. Paul, who was indeed, *the guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, and a teacher of babes.* In earnest, if JESUS, in these words, taught, that the Jewish Scriptures gave *eternal life,* (and the Jews could not have what their Scriptures did not give) he certainly taught a very different doctrine from St. PAUL, who expressly tells us, That IF THERE HAD BEEN A LAW GIVEN WHICH COULD HAVE GIVEN LIFE, VERILY RIGHTEOUSNESS SHOULD HAVE BEEN BY THE LAW.¶ All therefore that these

* Luke x. 25. † Gal. iii. 21, 22. ‡ John v. 39, 40. § Verse 16.
‖ Rom. ii. 19, 20. ¶ Gal. iii. 21.

words of Jesus teach us is, that the Jews THOUGHT *they had eternal life by the Mosaic Dispensation.* For the truth of what is just charged upon them, we have the concurrent testimony of the Apostles; Who wrote large portions of their EPISTLES to prove, not only that they *thought* so, but that they were greatly mistaken in so thinking. For the Author of the epistle to the Hebrews says, that *unto the Angels* [who delivered the Law to Moses] *hath he* [God] *not put in subjection the* WORLD TO COME, *whereof we speak.**

But though we should suppose, the words,—*ye think ye have eternal life,* considered separately, did not necessarily imply that these were *only* their thoughts, yet being opposed to the following words, *Ye will not come to me that ye* MIGHT HAVE LIFE, (Καὶ οὐ θέλετε ἐλθεῖν πρός με, ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχητε,) they shew, that whoever *thought* so besides, it was not JESUS, whose argument stands thus—"The Scriptures, I affirm, and am ready to prove, do testify of me. What reason then have you to disown my character? it cannot surely be, because I preach up a *new* Doctrine of life and immortality. For you yourselves teach that doctrine: and what is more, you understand several passages in your own Scriptures, to signify *eternal life;* which I own, in their *spiritual* meaning do so. Now that life, which you think you HAVE by your Scriptures, but HAVE NOT, do I here offer unto you, THAT YE MIGHT indeed HAVE LIFE." But if men had duly considered this discourse of Jesus to the unbelieving Jews, they would have seen the main drift and purpose of it was to rectify this fatal mistake of theirs, in *thinking they had eternal life in their Scriptures.* In one place he tells them, that those who *heard his word had passed from* DEATH *to life.*† And again, *the hour is coming, and now is, when the* DEAD *shall hear the voice of the Son of God.*‡ Where, by *Death* and the *Dead,* is meant the condition of those under the *Law,* subject to the condemnation of mortality.

V. The Objectors have produced St. Paul likewise to confute the Principle here laid down. This Apostle, in his epistle to the Romans, says—"For as many as have sinned without Law shall also perish without law: and *as many as have sinned in the Law shall be judged by the Law.*" § Now, say the Objectors, "had the Law concealed a future state from the Jews, it is plain they were not equitably dealt with, since they were to be judged in a future state." This brings to mind an objection of Lord Bolingbroke's against the divinity of Moses's Law; and the answer which this text enabled me to give to Him, will shew, that in these words of St. Paul, the Objectors have chosen the most unlucky text for their purpose in the whole New Testament. His Lordship's objection is in these words, "If Moses knew that crimes were to be punished in another life, he deceived the

* Heb. ii. 5. † John v. 24. ‡ Verse 25. § Rom. ii. 12.

people [in not acquainting them with the doctrine of a *future state*]. If he did not know it, I say it with horror, that God deceived both him and them.—The Israelites had better things to hope, and worse to fear, &c." * Now not to repeat what has been replied to this impious charge, elsewhere,† I will only observe, that the words of St. Paul above are a full confutation of it, where he says, that *as many as have sinned in the Law shall be judged by the Law:* that is, shall be judged on the principles of a Law which denounced punishment to vice, and reward to virtue. Those who had already received the punishment which that Law denounced should be *judged* to have done so; those, who in the times of the gradual decay of the *extraordinary* providence had escaped or evaded punishment, should have it hereafter. Nothing is clearer than this interpretation. For observe, I pray you, the difference of the predication between wicked men *without the Law*, and the wicked men *under the Law*. The first *shall perish*, ἀπολοῦνται: the second *shall be judged*, κριθήσονται, *or brought to trial*. For though κρίνω be often used in the New Testament for κατακρίνω, yet it is plain, that it is not so used here, both from the sense of the place, and the Apostle's change of terms, for which I think no good reason can be assigned but this, that κριθήσονται is opposed to ἀπολοῦνται. From all this, I think, it appears, that my Objectors were as much mistaken in their urging this text against my principles, as the noble Lord in supposing that the reality of a *future state* was a condemnation of the equity of the Law. But both took it for granted, and foolishly enough, that those who did not live under the sanction of a future state could never, consistently with justice, be summoned before the Tribunal there erected.

II.

We are now got to the very *Palladium* of the cause, the famous eleventh chapter to the Hebrews: where it is said, that by FAITH, Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, &c. performed all their acceptable works.—That *they looked for an heavenly city*.—That *they saw the Promises afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and desired an heavenly country*.—That *they all died in faith*.—*That Moses esteemed the reproach of* CHRIST *greater riches than the treasures of Egypt*.—That *by faith the Jewish leaders did all their great and marvellous works*.—That *their very women despised death in hopes to obtain a part in the resurrection of the just*.—And that *all these obtained a good report* THROUGH FAITH.—This, say the Objectors, plainly shews, that a future state of Rewards and Punishments, or more properly, the Christian Doc-

* Vol. v. pp. 194, 195. † See "A View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy," third edition, 8vo, pp. 225, et seq.

trine of *Life and Immortality*, was taught by the LAW.—To which I answer,

1. That if this be true, the eleventh chapter directly contradicts all the rest of the Epistle: In which, as we have shewn, there are more express declarations, that life and immortality was not known or taught by the Law, than in all the other books of the New Testament besides. And for which, indeed, a very good reason may be assigned, as it was solely addressed to the Jews, amongst whom this fatal prejudice, that *a future state was taught by the Law*, was then, and has continued ever since to be, the strongest impediment to their Conversion. For is it possible, that a Writer, who had said, that *the Law made nothing perfect, but the* BRINGING IN OF A BETTER HOPE DID;—That CHRIST *hath obtained a more excellent ministry than* MOSES, *by how much also he is the* MEDIATOR OF A BETTER COVENANT, *which is established upon* BETTER PROMISES;—That *the* LAW WAS ONLY A SHADOW OF GOOD THINGS TO COME, *and not the very image;* is it possible, I say, that such a Writer should forget himself before he came to the end of his Epistle, and, in contradiction to all this, affirm that *Life and Immortality was known and taught under the Law?* We may venture to say then, that this eleventh chapter must have a very different meaning. Let us see if we can find it out: and sure it requires no great search.

2. The whole argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews is directed against Jews and judaizing Christians. The point in difference was this: The Gospel taught JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH: The Judaizers thought it must needs be by WORKS. One consequence of which, in their opinion, was, that the Law of Moses was still in force. They had no more conception than our modern Socinians and Freethinkers, that there could be any merit in FAITH or Belief, where the understanding was unavoidably determined by evidence. The Reader sees then, that the dispute was not whether *faith in Moses* or *faith in* JESUS made men acceptable to GOD; but whether *works* or the *act of believing;* consequently, where the Apostle shews it was *faith*, or the *act of believing*, he must mean *faith* in the generic sense, not in the specific, i. e. he did not mean *faith in Jesus:* for the Jews, even that part of them which embraced JESUS as the Messiah, denied it to be any kind of *faith* whatsoever. On the contrary, had they held *justification* to be by *faith* in Moses, and not in JESUS, then it had been the Apostle's business to prove, that it was the *specific faith in* JESUS. But as the dispute stood, all he had to do was to prove that it was *the act of believing*, and not *works*, which justified. And this we find he does with infinite address; by shewing, that that thing which made all the Patriarchs before the Law, and all the Rulers and Prophets under the Law, acceptable to GOD, was not *works*, but *faith*.

But then what kind of *faith?* Doubtless *faith in God's promises:* for he is arguing on their own concessions. They admitted their ancestors to have had *that* faith:* they did not admit that they had faith *in* CHRIST. For the Apostle therefore to assert this, had been a kind of begging the question. Thus we see that not only the pertinency, but the whole force of the reasoning turns upon our understanding *faith,* in this chapter, to mean *faith in the God of their fathers.*

But the Apostle's own definition of the word puts the matter out of the question. We have said, the dispute between him and the Jewish Converts necessarily required him to speak of the efficacy of *faith* in the generic sense. Accordingly his *definition* of FAITH, is, that it is THE SUBSTANCE OF THINGS HOPED FOR, THE EVIDENCE OF THINGS NOT SEEN.† Not of *faith in the Messiah,* but of belief in general, and on good grounds. Indeed very general, according to this Writer; not only *belief* of the future, but the past. It is, says he, *the substance of things hoped for;* and this he illustrates by Noah's reliance on GOD's promise to save him in the approaching deluge.‡ It is, again, *the evidence of things not seen;* and this he illustrates by our belief that *the worlds were framed by the word of God.*§ Having defined what he means by *faith,* he next proceeds to shew its nature by its common efficacy, which still relates only to faith in the generic sense.—*But without faith it is impossible to please him* [GOD], *for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him;* ‖ which very *faith* he immediately illustrates by that of Noah, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and Moses. And that no doubt might remain, he farther illustrates it by the *faith* of the Jewish People passing the Red Sea, and encompassing the walls of Jericho; and by the *faith* of Rahab the harlot. But was any of this, the *faith* in JESUS the Messiah? or a belief of a future state of rewards and punishments?

As here the Apostle tells us of the great *rewards of faith,* so in his third chapter he speaks of the *punishment of unbelief;* which was the shutting out a whole generation from the land of Canaan, and suffering them to perish in the Wilderness: *So we see* (says he) *they could not enter in because of unbelief.*¶ But was this *unbelief* want of faith in the Messiah, or any thing but want of faith in the promise of the God of Israel, who assured them that he would drive out the Canaanite from before them? Lastly, to evince it impossible that *faith in the Messiah* should be meant by the *faith* in this eleventh chapter, the Apostle expressly says, that all those to whom he assigns

* Thus their Prophet Habakkuk had said, *The just shall live by his faith,* chap. ii. ver. 4. † Heb. xi. 1. ‡ Verse 7. § Verse 3. ‖ Verse 6. ¶ Heb. iii. 19.

this faith, HAD NOT RECEIVED THE PROMISE.* Therefore they could not have *faith* in that which was never yet proposed to them for the object of *faith*: *For how should they believe in him of whom they have not heard?* says the Apostle.

St. Paul had the same argument to manage in his Epistle to the Galatians; and he argues, from the advantages of *faith* or *belief in God*, in the very same manner. But of his argument, more in the next section.

Let us observe farther, that the sacred Writers not only use the word *faith* in its *generic* sense of *believing on reasonable grounds*; but likewise the word GOSPEL (a more appropriated term) for *good tidings in general*. Thus this very Writer to the Hebrews—*For unto us was the* GOSPEL *preached as well as unto them*,† i. e. the *Israelites*.

Having shewn, that by the *Faith*, here said to be so extensive amongst the Jewish People, is meant *faith in those promises of God* which related to their own Dispensation, all the weight of this objection is removed. For as to the *promises seen afar off and believed and embraced*, which gave the prospect of a *better country, that is, an heavenly*,‡ these are confined to the Patriarchs and Leaders of the Jewish People. And that *they* had this distant prospect, I am as much concerned to prove as my Adversaries themselves. And if I should undertake to do it more effectually, nobody I believe will think that I pretended to any great matter. But then let us still remember there is a vast difference between SEEING THE PROMISES AFAR OFF and RECEIVING THE PROMISE: the latter implying a gift bestowed; the former, only the obscure and distant prospect of one to come. This indeed they had: but as to the other, the sacred Writers assure us that, in general, they had it not.—*And these* ALL having *obtained a good report* through faith, RECEIVED NOT THE PROMISE.§ For though all the good Israelites in general had *faith in God*, and the Patriarchs and Leaders had the hope of a *better Country*, yet neither the one nor the other *received the Promise*.

I have said, that the *hopes of a better country*, is to be confined to the Patriarchs and Leaders of the ancient Jews: Nor is this contradicted by what is said of *others* who *were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better Resurrection*,‖ for this refers (as our *English* Bibles shew us) to the history of the Maccabees; in whose time it is confessed the Doctrine of a *future state* was become national. How the People got it—of what materials it was composed—and from what quarters it was fetched, will be seen hereafter. It is sufficient to observe at present, that all this, the Jews soon forgot, or hid from themselves, and made this new flattering Doctrine a part

* Heb. xi. 13, 39. † Heb. iv. 2. ‡ Heb. xi. 13—16. § Verse 39. ‖ Verse 35.

of the Law. Hence the Author of the Second book of Maccabees makes one of the Martyrs say—*For our brethren who now have suffered a short pain, are dead unto God's* COVENANT OF EVERLASTING LIFE.* But it may be asked, how came this *Covenant of everlasting life* to lye so perfectly concealed from the time of Moses to the great Captivity, that, as appears from their History, neither Princes nor People had the least apprehension or suspicion of such a Covenant?

But here a proper occasion offers itself to remove a seeming contradiction between the Writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and St. Paul, in his speech to the synagogue at Antioch; which will give still further light to the subject. The former says, *And these all having obtained a good report through faith,* RECEIVED NOT THE PROMISE.† And the latter, THE PROMISE WHICH WAS MADE UNTO THE FATHERS, *God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up* JESUS *again.*‡ But the contradiction is only seeming. The two texts are, indeed, very consistent. The Writer to the Hebrews is speaking of the condition of the heads and leaders of the faithful Israelites in general; who certainly had not the promise of the Gospel revealed unto them. St. Paul, in his speech to the Synagogue, is speaking particularly of their father ABRAHAM: as appears from his introductory address, *Men and Brethren, Children of the stock of Abraham;* § and Abraham certainly had the promise of the Gospel revealed unto him, as appears from the words of JESUS himself. *Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad.* He saw the resurrection of Jesus in the restoration of his son Isaac. But of this more hereafter. And to this solution, the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews himself directs us, who, though he had said that the holy men in general *received not the promise,* yet when he reckons up the distinct effects of each particular man's faith, he expressly says, *who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness,* OBTAINED PROMISES, *stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, &c.*‖ That is, some like David, through faith, *subdued kingdoms;* others, like Samuel, *wrought righteousness;* others, like Abraham, OBTAINED PROMISES; others, as Daniel, *stopped the mouths of lions;* and others, again, as his three companions, *quenched the violence of fire.* From whence I would infer these two conclusions:

1. That as the *promise* here said to be *obtained,* doth not contradict what the same Writer says presently after, that the faithful Israelites in general *received not the promise;* and as the *promise,* said by St. Paul to be *made to the fathers,* means the same thing with the PROMISES said, by the Writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, to be

* 2 Macc. vii. 36. † Heb. xi. 39. ‡ Acts xiii. 32, 33. § Verse 26
‖ Heb. xi. 33, 34.

OBTAINED, namely, the promises made to Abraham, *who saw* CHRIST'S *day*, and the oath sworn to David, that *of the fruit of his loins he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;* * consequently, neither do the words of St. Paul contradict the Writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, where he says, *these all received not the promise.* 2. As these gospel *Promises* are said to be *obtained by faith*, it follows that the FAITH mentioned in this famous eleventh chapter to the Hebrews, could not be faith *in the Messiah:* because the promises of a Messiah are here said to be the consequence of faith; but faith *in the Messiah* is the consequence of the *promises* of a Messiah: *For how could they believe in him of whom they had not heard?* From whence it appears, that the FAITH so much extolled in this chapter was *faith in God's veracity*, according to the interpretation given above.

III.

This is all, as far as I can learn, that hath been objected to my Proposition; and this *all* is such a confirmation of it, that I am in pain lest the reader should think I have prevaricated, and drawn out the strongest Texts in the New Testament to support my Opinion, under the name of a Confutation of it. But I have fairly given them as I found them urged: and to shew that I am no less severe, though a little more candid, to my own notions, than my Answerers are, I shall produce an objection which occurred to me in reading St. Paul's epistles of more real moment than their whole bundle of Texts weighed together. It is this:

The learned Apostle, in his reasoning against the Jews, argues upon a supposition, that "By the Law they had eternal life offered to them or laid before them, on condition of their exact performance of the Commandment; but that all coming short of perfect obedience, there was a necessity of recurring to FAITH."—*For what the Law could not do* (says he) *in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit.*†

This general Argument, which runs through the epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, wears indeed the face of an Objection to what I have advanced: but to understand the true value of it, we must consider the Apostle's end and purpose in writing. It was to rectify an error in the Jewish Converts, who would lay a necessity upon all men of conforming to the Law of Moses. As strangely superstitious as this may now appear to us, it seems to have been a very natural consequence of opinions then held by the whole Jewish Nation, as doctrines of Moses and of the Law; namely a *future state* of Rewards

* Acts ii. 30. † Rom. viii. 3, 4.

and Punishments, and the *resurrection* of the Body. Now these Doctrines, which easily disposed the less prejudiced part of the Jews to receive the *Gospel*, where they were taught more directly and explicitly, at the same time gave them wrong notions both of the Religion of MOSES and of JESUS: Which, by the way, I desire those, who so much contend for a *future state's* being in the Mosaic Dispensation, to take notice of. Their wrong notion of the LAW consisted in this, that having taken for granted, that the reward of obedience proposed by Moses was *Immortality*, and that this immortality could be obtained only by the *works* of the Law, therefore those works were, of necessity, to be observed. Their wrong notion of the GOSPEL consisted in this, that as *Immortality* was attached to *Works* by the *Law*, so it must needs be attached to *Works* by the *Gospel* also.

These were fatal mistakes. We have seen in our explanation of the eleventh chapter to the Hebrews how the Apostles combated the last of them, namely *Justification by Works*. The shewing now in what manner St. Paul opposed the other, of *obligation to the Law*, will explain the reasoning in question. Their opinion of obligation to the Law of Moses, was, as we say, founded on this principle, that it taught a *future state*, or offered *immortality* to its followers. The case was nice and delicate, and the confutation of the error required much address. What should our Apostle do? Should he in direct terms deny a *future state* was to be found in the Law? This would have shocked a general tradition supported by a national belief. Should he have owned that life and immortality came by the *Law?* This had not only fixed them in their error, but, what was worse, had tended to subvert the whole Gospel of JESUS. He has recourse therefore to this admirable expedient: The later Jews, in support of their national Doctrine of a *future state*, had given a *spiritual* sense to the Law. And this, which they did out of necessity, with little apparent grounds of conclusion then to be discovered, was seen, after the coming of the Messiah, to have the highest reasonableness and truth. Thus we find there were two *spiritual senses*, the one spurious, invented by the later Doctors of the Law; the other genuine, discovered by the Preachers of the Gospel; and these coinciding well enough in the main, St. Paul was enabled to seize a *spiritual* sense, and from thence to argue on their own principles, that the Law of Moses could not now oblige; which he does in this irresistible manner. "*The Law*," says he, "*we know is spiritual;* * that is, in a spiritual sense promises immortality: for it says, *Do this and live.*† Therefore *he who does the deeds of the Law shall live.*‡ But what then? *I am carnal:* § And *all have sinned, and come short of the*

* Rom. vii. 14. † Lev. xviii. 5. Gal. iii. 12. ‡ Rom. x. 5. § Rom. vii. 14.

glory of God: * So that no flesh can be *justified by the deeds of the Law,*† which requires a perfect obedience. *Works* then being unprofitable, we must have recourse to *Faith:* But *the Law is not of Faith:* ‡ Therefore the Law is unprofitable for the attainment of salvation, and consequently no longer obligatory."—Never was an important argument more artfully conducted, where the erroneous are brought into the right way on their own principles, and yet the truth not given up or betrayed. This would have been admired in a Greek or Roman Orator.

But though the *principle* he went upon was common both to him and his adversaries, and consequently true, that the Law was *spiritual*, or had a spiritual meaning, whereby, under the species of those temporal promises of the Law, the promises of the Gospel were shadowed out; yet the *inference* from thence, that the LAW *offered immortality* to its followers, was solely Jewish, and urged by St. Paul as an argument *ad hominem* only; which appears certain from these considerations:

1. This *spiritual* sense, which St. Paul owns to be in the Law, was not a sense which was conveyed down with the literal, by Moses, to the followers of the Law; but was a sense *invented* or *discovered* long after;—the spurious, by the later Jewish Doctors; and the genuine and real, by the Apostles; as appears from these words of St. Paul: —*But now we are delivered from the Law, that being* DEAD *wherein we were held, that we should serve in* NEWNESS OF SPIRIT, *and not in the* OLDNESS OF THE LETTER.§ We see here, the Apostle gives the *letter* to the Jewish Œconomy, and the *spirit* to the Christian. Let me observe how exactly this quadrates with, and how well it explains, what he says in another place; where having told the Corinthians that he and his Fellow-Apostles were *ministers of the New Testament, not of the letter but of the spirit,* he adds, *the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.* The Jews had only the *letter* delivered to them by the Law, but the Letter killeth; the consequence is, that the *Law* (in which was only the *letter)* had no future state.

2. Secondly, Supposing St. Paul really to hold that the *Law offered immortality to its followers,* and that that immortality was attached (as his argument supposes it) to *Works,* it would contradict the other reasoning which both he himself and the author of the epistle to the Hebrews urged so cordially against the second error of the Jewish Converts; namely, of *immortality's* being attached to *works,* or that *justification* was by *works* under the Gospel: for to confute this error, they prove, as we have shewn, that it was *faith* which *justified,* not only under the Gospel, but under the Law also.

3. Thirdly, If immortality were indeed offered through *works,* by

* Rom. iii. 23. † Gal. ii. 16; iii. 11. ‡ Gal. iii. 12. § Rom. vii. 6.

the *Law*, then *justification by faith*, one of the great fundamental doctrines of Christianity,* would be infringed. For then *faith* could, at best, be only supposed to make up the defect of *works*, in such a sense as to enable *works* to *justify*.

4. Fourthly, It would directly contradict what St. Paul in other places says of the Law; as that *it is a shadow of things to come, but that the body is of* CHRIST.† But the offer of immortality on one condition, could never be called the *shadow* of the offer of it on another. *That it is the schoolmaster to bring men to Christ.*‡ Now, by the unhappy dexterity of these men, who, in defiance of the Apostle, will needs give the doctrines of *grace and truth*, as well as the doctrines of the *Law*, to MOSES, His appointed SCHOOLMASTER, the Law, is made to act a part that would utterly discredit every other *schoolmaster*, namely to teach his children, yet in their *Elements*,§ the sublime doctrines of manly science.

5. Fifthly and lastly, if St. Paul intended this for any more than an argument *ad hominem*, he contradicted himself, and misled his disciple Timothy, whom he expressly assured, that *our Saviour Jesus Christ hath* ABOLISHED DEATH, *and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel*. And lest, by this *bringing to light*, any one should mistake him to mean only that Jesus Christ had made life and immortality more clear and manifest, than Moses had done, he adds, that our Saviour had *abolished or destroyed Death*, or that state of mortality and extinction into which mankind had fallen by the transgression of Adam; and in which, they continued under the Law of Moses, as appears from that Law's having no other sanction than *temporal rewards and punishments*. Now this state must needs be abolished, before another could be introduced: consequently by *bringing life and immortality to light*, must needs be meant, the introduction of a new system.

I will only observe, that the excellent Mr. Locke was not aware of the nature of the argument in question; and so, on its mistaken authority, hath seemed to suppose that the Law did indeed offer immortality to its followers: This hath run him into great perplexities throughout his explanation of St. Paul's epistles.

Thus we have at length proved our THIRD PROPOSITION, *That the Doctrine of a future state of Rewards and Punishments is not to be found in, nor did make part of, the Mosaic Dispensation;* and, as we presume, to the satisfaction of every capable and impartial reader.

But to give these arguments credit with those who determine only by AUTHORITY, I shall, in the last place, support them with the

* This I shall shew hereafter; and endeavour to rescue it from the madness of enthusiasm on the one hand, and the absurdity of the common system on the other, and yet not betray it, in explaining it away under the fashionable pretence of delivering the *Scripture Doctrine* of it. † Col. ii. 17. ‡ Gal. iii. 24. § Gal. iv. 3—9.

opinions of three Protestant Writers; but these Three worth a million. The first is the illustrious GROTIUS—"Moses in Religionis Judaicæ Institutione, si diserta Legis respicimus, nihil promisit supra hujus vitæ bona, terram uberem, penum copiosum, victoriam de hostibus, longam et valentem senectutem, posteros cum bona spe superstites. Nam, SI QUID EST ULTRA, in umbris obtegitur, aut sapienti ac DIFFICILI ratiocinatione colligendum est."

The second is the excellent EPISCOPIUS.—"In tota Lege Mosaica nullum vitæ æternæ præmium, ac ne æterni quidem præmii INDICIUM VEL VESTIGIUM extat: quicquid nunc Judæi multum de futuro seculo, de resurrectione mortuorum, de vita æterna loquantur, et ex Legis verbis ea extorquere potius quam ostendere conentur, NE LEGEM MOSIS IMPERFECTAM ESSE COGANTUR AGNOSCERE cum Sadducæis; quos olim (et, uti observo ex scriptis Rabbinorum, hodieque) vitam futuri sæculi Lege Mosis nec promitti nec contineri adfirmasse, quum tamen Judæi essent, certissimum est. Nempe non nisi per Cabalam sive Traditionem, quam illi in universum rejiciebant, opinionem sive fidem illam irrepsisse asserebant. Et sane opinionum, quæ inter Judæos erat, circa vitam futuri sæculi discrepantia, arguit promissiones Lege factas tales esse ut ex iis certi quid de vita futuri sæculi non possit colligi. Quod et Servator noster non obscure innuit, cum resurrectionem mortuorum colligit Mat. XXII. non ex promisso aliquo Legi addito, sed ex generali tantum illo promisso Dei, quo se Deum Abrahami, Isaaci, et Jacobi futurum spoponderat: quæ tamen illa collectio magis nititur cognitione intentionis divinæ sub generalibus istis verbis occultatæ aut comprehensæ, de qua Christo certo constabat, quàm necessaria consequentia, sive verborum vi ac virtute manifestâ, qualis nunc et in verbis Novi Testamenti, ubi vita æterna et resurrectio mortuorum proram et puppim faciunt totius Religionis Christianæ, et tam clarè ac disertè promittuntur ut ne hiscere quidem contra quis possit."*

And the third is our learned Bishop BULL:—"Primo quæritur an in V. Testamento nullum omnino extet vitæ æternæ promissum? de eo enim à nonnullis dubitatur. Resp. Huic quæstioni optimè mihi videtur respondere Augustinus, distinguens nomen Veteris Testamenti: nam eo intelligi ait aut pactum illud, quod in Monte Sinai factum est, aut omnia, quæ in Mose, Hagiographis, ac Prophetis continentur. Si Vetus Testamentum posteriori sensu accipiatur, concedi FORSITAN possit, esse in eo nonnulla futuræ vitæ non obscura indicia; præsertim in Libro Psalmorum, Daniele, et Ezekiele: quanquam vel in his libris clarum ac disertum æternæ vitæ promissum VIX AC NE VIX quidem reperias. Sed hæc QUALIACUNQUE erant, non erant nisi

* *Institut. Theolog.* lib. iii. sect. i. cap. 2.

præludia et anticipationes gratiæ Evangelicæ, AD LEGEM NON PERTINEBANT.—Lex enim promissa habuit *terrena*, et *terrena* TANTUM.—Si quis contra sentiat, ejus est locum dare, ubi æternæ vitæ promissio extat; QUOD CERTE IMPOSSIBILE EST.—Sub his autem verbis [legis ipsius] Dei intentione comprehensam fuisse vitam æternam, ex interpretatione ipsius Christi ejusque Apostolorum manifestum est. Verùm hæc non sufficiunt ut dicamus vitam æternam in Fœdere Mosaico promissam fuisse. Nam primò promissa, præsertim Fœderi annexa, debent esse clara ac diserta, et ejusmodi, ut ab utraque parte stipulante intelligi possint. Promissa autem hæc TYPICA et generalia, non additâ aliunde interpretatione, PENE IMPOSSIBILE ERAT, UT QUIS ISTO SENSU INTELLIGERET."*

Thus these three capital supports of the Protestant Church. But let the man be of what Church he will, so he have a superiority of understanding and be not defective in integrity, you shall always hear him speak the same Language. The great ARNAULD, that shining ornament of the Gallican Church, urges this important truth with still more frankness.—"C'est LE COMBLE DE L'IGNORANCE" (says this accomplished Divine) "de mettre en doute cette vérité, qui est une des plus communes de la Religion Chretienne, et qui est ATTESTEE PAR TOUS LES PERES, que *les promesses de l'ancien Testament n'etoient que temporelles et terrestres, et que les Juifs n'adoroient Dieu que pour les biens charnels.*"† And what more hath been said or done by the Author of the DIVINE LEGATION? Indeed, a great deal more. He hath shewn, "That the absence or omission of a future state of rewards and punishments in the Mosaic Religion is a certain proof that its original was from God." *Forgive him this wrong*, my reverend Brethren!

SECTION V.

BUT though it appear that *a future state of Rewards and Punishments made no part of the Mosaic Dispensation*, yet the LAW had certainly a SPIRITUAL meaning, to be understood when the fulness of time should come: And hence it received the nature, and afforded the efficacy, of PROPHECY. In the interim, the MYSTERY OF THE GOSPEL was occasionally revealed by GOD to his chosen Servants, the Fathers and Leaders of the Jewish Nation; and the dawning of it was gradually opened by the Prophets, to the People.

And which is exactly agreeable to what our excellent Church in its SEVENTH ARTICLE *of Religion* teacheth concerning this matter.

* *Harmonia Apostolica*, dissertat. posterior, cap. x. sect. 8, p. 474, inter *Opera omnia*, ed. 1721. † *Apologie de Port-Royal.* And see note LL, at the end of this book.

ARTICLE VII.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting Life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign, that the Old Fathers did look only for transitory Promises.

—*The Old Testament is not contrary to the New,* is a proposition directed against the Manichean error, to which the opinions of some Sectaries of these later times seemed to approach. The Manicheans fancied there was a Good and an Evil Principle; that the Old Dispensation was under the *Evil,* and that the New was the work of the *Good.* Now it hath been proved that the Old Testament is so far from being contrary to the New, that it was the Foundation, Rudiments, and Preparation for it.

—*For both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by* CHRIST, *who is the only Mediator between God and Man.* That the Church could not mean by these words, that everlasting life was offered to mankind by CHRIST in the Old Testament in the SAME MANNER in which it is offered by the New, is evident from these considerations:

1. The Church, in the preceding words, only says, the *Old Testament is* NOT CONTRARY *to the New;* but did she mean that everlasting life was offered by both, in the *same manner,* she would certainly have said, *The Old Testament is* THE SAME *with the New.* This farther appears from the inference drawn from the proposition concerning everlasting life—WHEREFORE *they are not to be heard, which feign, that the old* FATHERS *did look only for transitory promises.* But was this pretended sense the true, then the inference had been, *That* ALL THE ISRAELITES *were instructed to look for more than transitory promises.*

2. The Church could not mean that everlasting life is offered in the Old and New Testament in the *same manner,* because we learn from St. Austin, that this was one of the old Pelagian heresies, condemned by the Catholics in the Synod of Diospolis,—QUOD LEX SIC MITTAT AD REGNUM [COELORUM] QUEMADMODUM ET EVANGELIUM.*

What was meant therefore by the words—*both in the Old and New Testament everlasting Life is offered to Mankind by* CHRIST, was plainly this; "That the offer of everlasting Life to Mankind by CHRIST in the New Testament was SHADOWED OUT in the Old; the SPIRITUAL meaning of the Law and the Prophets referring to that life and *immortality, which was brought to light* by JESUS CHRIST."

3. But lastly, Whatever meaning the Church had in these words, it cannot at all affect our Proposition, *that a future state was not*

* *De Gestis Pelagii,* cap. xi. § 24.

taught by the Law of Moses; because by *the Old Testament* is ever meant both the *Law* and the *Prophets.* Now I hold that the Prophets gave strong intimations, though in figurative language borrowed from the Jewish Œconomy, of the *everlasting life* offered to mankind by JESUS CHRIST.

The concluding words of the Article which relate to this matter, say,—*wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign, that the* OLD FATHERS *did look only for transitory promises;* and so say I: because JESUS himself is to be heard, before all such; and he affirms the direct contrary of the *Father of the faithful* in particular. *Your father Abraham* (says he to the unbelieving Jews) *rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad.** A fact not only of the utmost certainty in itself, but of the highest importance to be rightly understood. That I may not therefore be suspected of prevarication, I chuse this instance (the noblest that ever was given of the HARMONY between the Old and New Testament) to illustrate this consistent truth.

I.

And I persuade myself that the learned Reader will be content to go along with me, while I take occasion, from these remarkable words of JESUS, to explain the history of the famous COMMAND TO ABRAHAM TO OFFER UP HIS SON; for to this History, I shall prove, the words refer; and by their aid I shall be enabled to justify a revolting circumstance in it, which has been long the stumbling-block of Infidelity.

In the sense in which the History of the COMMAND hath been hitherto understood, the best apology for Abraham's behaviour (and it is hard we should be obliged, at this time of day, to make apologies for an action, which, we are told, had the greatest merit in the sight of God) seems to be this, that having had much intercourse with the GOD of Heaven, whose Revelations (not to say, his voice of Nature) spoke him a good and just Being, Abraham concluded that this *command to sacrifice his son,* conveyed to him like the rest, by the same strong and clear impression on the Sensory, came also from the same God. How rational soever this solution be, the Deist, perhaps, would be apt to tell us it was little better than Electra's answer to Orestes, who, staggering in his purpose to kill his mother by the command of Apollo, says: *But if, after all, this should be an evil Demon, who, bent upon mischief, hath assumed the form of a God?* She replies, *What, an evil Demon possess the sacred Tripod? It is not to be supposed.*†

But the idea hitherto conceived of this important History has sub-

* John viii. 56.

† Ορ. Ἆρ' αὖτ' ἀλάστωρ εἶπ' ἀπεικασθεὶς θεῷ;
ΗΛ. Ἱερὸν καθίζων τρίποδ'; Ἐγὼ μὲν οὐ δοκῶ.—EURIPIDIS *Electra*, verse 979.

jected it even to a worse abuse than that of Infidelity: Fanatics, carnally as well as spiritually licentious, have employed it to countenance and support the most abominable of their Doctrines and Practices. Rimius in his *Candid Narrative* hath given us a strange passage from the writings of the *Moravian Brethren*, which the reader, from a note of his, will find transcribed here below.*

However, after saving and reserving to ourselves the benefit of all those arguments, which have been hitherto brought to support the history of the COMMAND; I beg leave to say, that the source of all the difficulty is the very wrong idea men have been taught to entertain of it, while it was considered as given for a TRYAL ONLY of Abraham's faith; and consequently as a Revelation unsought by him, and unrelated to any of those before vouchsafed unto him: Whereas, in truth, it was a Revelation ARDENTLY DESIRED, had the CLOSEST CONNECTION with, and was, indeed, the COMPLETION OF ALL THE FOREGOING; which were all directed to one end; as the gradual view of the orderly parts of one intire Dispensation required: consequently, the principal purpose of the COMMAND was not to try Abraham's faith, although its nature was such, that in the very giving of it, *God did*, indeed, *tempt* or *try Abraham*.†

In plain terms, the Action was enjoined as the conveyance of information to the Actor, of something he had requested to know: This mode of information by *Signs* instead of *Words* being, as we have shewn, of common practice in those early Ages: And as the force of the following reasoning is founded on that ancient custom, I must request the Reader carefully to review what hath been said between the one hundred and eighty-fifth and one hundred and ninetieth pages of the second volume, concerning the origin, progress, and various modes of personal converse; where it is seen, how the conveying information, and giving directions, to Another, by *Signs* and *Actions*, instead of *Words*, came to be of general practice in the first rude Ages; and how, in compliance therewith, GOD was pleased frequently to converse with the holy Patriarchs and Prophets in that very manner.

Laying down therefore what hath been said on this subject, in the place referred to, as a Postulatum; I undertake to prove the following Proposition:

I.

THAT WHEN GOD SAYS TO ABRAHAM, *TAKE NOW THY SON, THINE ONLY SON, ISAAC, &c.*‡ THE COMMAND IS

* "He (the Saviour) can dispose of life and soul; he can make the œconomy of salvation, and change it every hour, that the hindermost be the foremost: He can make laws and abrogate them; HE CAN MAKE THAT TO BE MORAL WHICH IS AGAINST NATURE; the greatest virtue to be the most villainous action, and the most virtuous thoughts to be the most criminal: He can in a quarter of an hour, make ABRAHAM willing to kill his Son, which however is the most abominable thought a man can have." —COUNT ZINZENDORF'S "Serm." in Rimius, p. 53. † Gen. xxii. 1. ‡ Verse 2.

MERELY AN INFORMATION BY ACTION, INSTEAD OF WORDS, OF THE GREAT SACRIFICE OF CHRIST FOR THE REDEMPTION OF MANKIND, GIVEN AT THE EARNEST REQUEST OF ABRAHAM, WHO LONGED IMPATIENTLY *TO SEE CHRIST'S DAY;* and is, in its nature, exactly the same as those informations to the Prophets, where to this Man, God says, *Make thee bonds and yokes, and put them on thy neck;** to another—*Go take unto thee a wife of whoredoms,*† *&c.* and to a third:—*Prepare thee stuff for removing,*‡ *&c.* that is, AN INFORMATION OF HIS PURPOSE BY ACTION INSTEAD OF WORDS; in the first case, foretelling the conquests of Nebuchadnezzar over Edom, Moab, Ammon, Tyre, and Sidon; in the second, declaring his abhorrence of the idolatries of the House of Israel; and in the third, the approaching Captivity of Zedekiah.

The foundation of my Thesis I lay in that scripture of St. John, where JESUS says to the unbelieving *Jews*, YOUR FATHER ABRAHAM REJOICED TO SEE MY DAY; AND HE SAW IT, AND WAS GLAD.§

1. If we consider Abraham's personal character, together with the choice made of him for head and origin of that People which GOD would separate and make holy to himself; from whence was to arise the REDEEMER of Mankind, the ultimate end of that separation; we cannot but conclude it probable, that the knowledge of this Redeemer would be revealed to him. *Shall I hide from Abraham the thing which I do?* ‖ says GOD, in a matter that much less concerned the Father of the Faithful. And here, in the words of JESUS, we have this probable truth arising from the nature of the thing, made certain and put out of all reasonable question—*Abraham rejoiced*, says JESUS, *to see my* DAY,¶ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν. Now when the figurative word *day* is used, not to express in general *the period of any one's existence*, but to denote his peculiar *office and employment*, it must needs signify that very circumstance in his life, which is *characteristic* of such office and employment. But JESUS is here speaking of his peculiar office and employment, as appears from the occasion of the debate, which was his saying, *If any man keep my commandments, he shall never taste of death*, intimating thereby the virtue of his office of Redeemer. Therefore, by the word DAY must needs be meant that *characteristic* circumstance of his life; But that circumstance was the laying down his life for the Redemption of Mankind. Consequently, by the word DAY is meant *the great sacrifice of* CHRIST.** Hence we may discover the real or affected ignorance of the *Socinian* Comment upon this place; which would have *day* only to signify in general the life of CHRIST, or the period of his abode here on earth.

* Jer. xxvii. 2. † Hosea i. 2. ‡ Ezek. xii. 3. § John viii. 56.
‖ Gen. xviii. 17. ¶ John viii. 56. ** See note MM, at the end of this book.

To reconcile the learned Reader to the propriety and elegance as well as to the truth of this sense of the word, *Day*, he may observe, that as Jesus intitles his great Work, in his state of humiliation, the *Redemption of Mankind*, by the name of HIS DAY; so is he pleased to give the same appellation to his other great Work, in his triumphant state, *the Judgment of Mankind*. "For as the lightning" (says he) "that lightneth out of the one part under heaven,—so shall also the Son of Man be, in HIS DAY." * But this figure is indeed as usual in Scripture as it is natural in itself. Thus that signal catastrophe in the fortunes of the Jewish People, both temporal and spiritual, *their Restoration*, is called their DAY.—*Then shall the Children of Judah* (says God by the Prophet Hosea) *and the children of Israel, be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out of the land: for great shall be* THE DAY *of Israel*.†

2. But not only the *matter*, but the *manner*, likewise of this great Revelation, is delivered in the text—*Abraham rejoiced to* SEE *my day, and he* SAW *it and was glad*.—ἵνα ΙΔΗι τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμὴν, καὶ ΕΙΔΕ—This evidently shews the Revelation to have been made, not by *relation* in words, but by REPRESENTATION in action. The verb εἴδω is frequently used in the New Testament, in its proper signification, to *see sensibly*. But whether used literally or figuratively, it always denotes a full intuition. That the expression was as strong in the Syrian language used by JESUS, as here in the Greek of his Historian, appears from the reply the Jews made to him—*Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou* SEEN *Abraham?* ‡ Plainly intimating that they understood the assertion of *Abraham's seeing Christ's day* to be a real beholding him in person. We must conclude therefore, from the words of the text, that the Redemption of Mankind was not only revealed to Abraham, but was revealed likewise by *representation*. A late Writer, extremely well skilled in the style of Scripture, was so sensible of the force of JESUS's words, that, though he had no suspicion they related to any part of Abraham's recorded history, yet he saw plainly they implied an information by representation—*Thus also Abraham* (says he) *saw the day of* CHRIST *and was glad. But this must be in a typical or prophetical vision.*§ The excellent Dr. Scott is of the same opinion. He supposes "the words refer to some peculiar discoveries, which the Spirit of God might make to Abraham, for his own private consolation, though not recorded in Scripture." ‖

So far, then, is clear, that Abraham had indeed this Revelation. The next question will be, whether we can reasonably expect to find it in the history of his life, recorded in the Old Testament? And that

* Luke xvii. 24. † Hosea i. 11. ‡ John viii. 57. § See note NN, the end of this book. ‖ "Christian Life," vol. v. p. 194.

we may find it here, both the words of JESUS, and the nature of the thing, assure us.

1. We learn, by the history of CHRIST'S Ministry, that in his disputations with the Jews, he never urged them with any circumstance of GOD'S Dispensations to their Forefathers, which they either were not, or might not be, well acquainted with by the study of their Scriptures. The reason is evident. His credentials were two-fold, SCRIPTURE and MIRACLES. In the first way therefore of confirming his Mission, if instead of appealing to the course of GOD'S Dispensation to his chosen People, as delivered in Scripture, he had given them an unknown history of that Dispensation, (as was one of the tricks of Mahomet in his Alcoran) such a method had been so far from supporting his Character, that it would have heightened the unfavourable prejudices of Unbelievers towards him; as looking like a confession that the known history was against him; and that he was forced to invent a new one, to countenance his pretensions. He must, therefore, for the necessary support of his Character, appeal to some acknowledged Facts. These were all contained in SCRIPTURE and TRADITION. But, we know, he always studiously declined supporting himself on their *Traditions*, though they were full of circumstances favourable to the Religion he came to propagate, such as the doctrines *of eternal Life*, and the *Resurrection of the Body*: Nay, he took all occasions of decrying their TRADITIONS as impious corruptions, by which they *had rendered the* WRITTEN *word of none effect*. We conclude, therefore, from JESUS'S own words, that the circumstance of Abraham's knowledge of his *Day* is certainly to be found in Abraham's history: Not in so clear a manner, indeed, as to be understood by a Carnal-minded Jew, nor even by a System-making Christian, for reasons hereafter to be explained; yet certainly There; and certainly proved to be There, by the best rules of logic and criticism.

2. But though this did not (as it does) appear from the words of JESUS, yet it might be collected from the very nature of the thing. For admit only the fact, (as we now must) that *Abraham did see* CHRIST'S *Day*, and it is utterly incredible that so capital a circumstance should be omitted in his History, a sacred Record, pre-ordained for one of the supports and evidences of CHRIST'S Religion. That it could not be delivered in the book of Genesis, in terms plainly to be understood by the People, during the first periods of a preparatory Dispensation, is very certain: as will be seen hereafter: But then, this is far from being a reason why it should not be recorded at all: Great ends, such as supporting the truth of the future Dispensation, being to be gained by the delivery of it even in so obscure a manner.

Having thus far cleared our way, and shewn, that *the doctrine of Redemption* was revealed to Abraham; and that the history of that Reve-

lation is recorded in Scripture; we proceed to the proof of these two points:

I. That there is no place, in the whole history of *Abraham*, but this, where he is commanded to offer up his Son, which bears the least marks or resemblance of such a Revelation.

II. That this Command to offer up his Son has all the marks of such a Revelation.

I. On the first head, it will be necessary to give a short abstract of Abraham's story: in which we find a regular account of the course and order of GOD's Dispensations to him, from the time of his being called out of Chaldea, to the Command to offer up his Son Isaac; the last of GOD's Revelations to him, recorded in Scripture.

The first notice given us of this Patriarch is in the account of his Genealogy, Family, and Country.* We are then told,† that God called him from his father's house to *a Land which he should shew him:* And to excite his obedience, he promises to make of him *a great Nation:* ‡ to have him in his peculiar protection, and to *make all the Nations of the Earth blessed through him.*§ The last part of this promise is remarkable, as it contains the proper end of GOD's Choice and Separation of him and his Posterity; and so, very fitly made, by the sacred Writer, the foundation of the history of GOD's Dispensations to him; and a mark to direct the reader to what, they are all ultimately to be referred. Which, by the way, exposes the extreme absurdity in Collins and Tindal, who would have the *blessing* here promised to be only an Eastern form of speech, honourable to the Father of the Faithful.—When Abraham, in obedience to this command, was come into the land of Canaan,‖ GOD vouchsafed him a farther Revelation of his Will; and now told him, that this was the Land (which he had before said he *would shew him)* to be inherited by *his Seed.*¶ When he returned from Egypt, GOD revealed himself still farther, and *marked* out the *bounds* ** of that Land, which he assured him should be *to him and his Seed for ever.*†† Which *Seed* should be *as the dust of the earth* for number.‡‡ After all these gracious and repeated assurances, we may well suppose Abraham to be now grown uneasy at his Wife's barrenness, and his own want of issue to inherit the Promises. Accordingly, we find him much disturbed with these apprehensions; §§ and that GOD, to remove them, appeared to him in a *vision,* and said, *Fear not, Abram; I am thy shield and exceeding great reward.* Abraham, thus encouraged to tell his grief, confessed it to be for his want of issue, and for that he suspected the promised blessings were to be inherited by his adopted children,

* Gen. xi. 27, et seq. † Gen. xii. 1. ‡ Verse 2. § Verse 3. ‖ Verse 5. ¶ Verse 7. ** Gen. xiii. 14. †† Verse 15. ‡‡ Verse 16. §§ Gen. xv. 1.

the sons of his servant *Eliezer of Damascus*.* To ease him of this disquiet, GOD was now pleased to acquaint him, that his design was not, that an adopted son should inherit, but one *out of his own bowels*.† And, for farther assurance, he instructs him in the various fortunes of his Posterity.—*That his Seed should be a stranger in a Land that was not theirs, which Land should afflict them four hundred years, and that then he would judge that Nation, and afterwards bring them out with great substance to inherit the Land of Canaan*.‡ At the same time GOD more particularly marks out the bounds of the Promised Land, and reckons up the several Nations which then inhabited it.§ Things being in this train, and Abraham now satisfied that the Seed of his loins was to inherit the Promises; Sarah, on account of her sterility, persuaded her Husband to go in, unto her Hand-maid Hagar, the Egyptian.‖ In this she indulged her own vanity and ambition; she would have a Son whom she might adopt; *it may be* (says she) *that I may obtain children by her*;¶ and she flattered herself with being, at the same time, an instrument to promote the designs of Providence: *Behold now* (says she) *the Lord hath restrained me from bearing*. To this project Abraham consented. Hagar conceived, and bare a Son, called Ishmael.** The good Patriarch was now fully satisfied: He grew fond of Ishmael; and reckoned upon *him* for the inheritor of the promises. To correct this mistake, GOD vouchsafed him a new Revelation;†† in which he is told, that GOD would not only (as had been before promised) bless and multiply his Posterity in an extraordinary manner, but would separate them from all other Nations, and he would be their GOD, and they should be his PEOPLE.‡‡ And this *national adoption* requiring a mutual Covenant, the rite of CIRCUMCISION is at the same time enjoined as the mark of the Covenant.§§ Lastly, Abraham is shewn his fond mistake, and told, that it was not the *Son of the bond-woman*, but of his Wife Sarah, who was ordained to be Heir of the Promises.‖‖ But Abraham had so long indulged himself in his mistake, and consequently in his affection for Ishmael, that he begs GOD would indulge it too—*O that Ishmael might live before thee*.¶¶ And GOD, in compassion to his paternal fondness, graciously promises that the Posterity of Ishmael should become exceeding great and powerful,*** but that, nevertheless, his Covenant should be with *Isaac, and with his Seed after him*.††† However, this Revelation having been received with some kind of doubt, as appears by the words of the historian,‡‡‡ God was pleased to repeat the promise of a Son by

* Gen. xv. 2, 3. † Verse 4. ‡ Verses 13, 14. § Verse 18, to the end. ‖ Gen. xvi. ¶ Verse 2. ** Verse 15. †† Gen. xvii. ‡‡ Verse 7, et seq. §§ See note OO, at the end of this book. ‖‖ Gen. xvii. 16. ¶¶ Verse 18. *** Verse 20, et seq. ††† Verse 19. ‡‡‡ Verse 17.

Sarah: * and even to mark the time of his birth;† according to which, *Sarah conceived and bore Abraham a Son.*‡ After this, GOD revealed himself yet again to Abraham,§ with a command to put away his Son Ishmael; and to assure him, that the CHOSEN POSTERITY should come from Isaac: For Abraham was not yet weaned from his unreasonable partiality for Ishmael; but still reckoned upon him as his *Second hopes*, in case of any disaster or misfortune, that should happen to Isaac. This appears from Ishmael's insolent behaviour; ‖ from Abraham's great unwillingness to dismiss him; ¶ and from God's assuring him, in order to make him easy, *That in Isaac his Seed should be called.*** We now come to the famous History of the Command to offer up his Son Isaac.—*And it came to pass*, (says the sacred historian) AFTER THESE THINGS, *that God did tempt Abraham, and said: Take now thy Son*, THINE ONLY SON *Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee unto the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt-offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of. And Abraham arose, &c.*†† This was the last of God's Revelations to Abraham—*And it came to pass after these things.*—And with this the history of them is closed.

Here we see all these Revelations, except the last, are plain and clear, as referring to TEMPORAL Felicities to be conferred on Abraham and his Posterity after the flesh; through whom, some way or other, a BLESSING was to extend to all Mankind. Not one of these therefore can pretend to be that Revelation of the *Redemption of the world.* The last is the only dark and obscure one of the whole; which, if indeed a Revelation of this grand Mystery, must of necessity, as we shall shew, be darkly and obscurely *recorded.*

But to this perhaps it may be objected, that the famous Promise of GOD to Abraham, that *in him should all the Families of the earth be blessed,*‡‡ is that Revelation; because St. Paul calls this the preaching of the Gospel unto him—*And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Heathen through Faith, preached before, the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations of the earth be blessed.*§§ To this I reply, that the Apostle is here convincing the Galatians, that the Gospel of CHRIST is founded on the same PRINCIPLE with that which justified Abraham, namely FAITH;—*Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.*‖‖ He then pursues his argument in this manner, *Therefore they which be of Faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.*¶¶ The reason he gives is from the promise in question, given in reward of Abraham's *Faith*, that *in him should all Nations be blessed.* This is the force of the argument; and it is

* Gen. xviii. † Verses 10, 14. ‡ Gen. xxi. 2. § Verse 12. ‖ Verse 9. ¶ Verse 11. ** Verse 12. †† Gen. xxii. 1—3. ‡‡ Gen. xii. 3. §§ Gal. iii. 8. ‖‖ Verse 6. ¶¶ Verse 9.

very finely managed. But then the terms, *Faith* and *Gospel*, are here used, as they very often are in the apostolic writings,* not in their specific but generic sense, for *confidence in any one*, and *glad tidings in general*. For it is plain, Abraham's *Faith* here recommended, was not that *Christian Faith* in JESUS the MESSIAH, but, faith in GOD, who had promised to make his Posterity according to the flesh, as numerous as the stars of Heaven, when as yet he had no offspring.† In a like latitude of expression, St. Paul uses the word προευαγγελίζομαι, to *preach the Gospel beforehand;* not the tidings of the Messiah the Redeemer, but the *effects* of the *Redemption* wrought by him, a BLESSING on the whole race of mankind. Tidings which indeed referred to a future Dispensation: and, in this, differing from his use of the word *Faith*, which did not. But then, this is very far from his SEEING CHRIST'S DAY: of which indeed he speaks in another place, as we shall see presently. It is true, this promised BLESSING was the preparatory Revelation, by which, we were to estimate the ultimate end of all the following; and on which, we must suppose them to be built: And so much we are concerned to prove it was. I conclude therefore, that when Jesus says, *Abraham saw his Day;* and when St. Paul says, that he *had the Gospel preached before unto him*, they spoke of two different Revelations. We come, therefore,

II. To the second point: which is to shew, that the COMMAND to offer up Isaac was the very revelation of CHRIST'S DAY, or the Redemption of mankind, by his death and sufferings.

1. We may observe, from this short view of Abraham's history, that all GOD'S Revelations to him, even unto this last, open by degrees; and relate, primarily indeed, to his Posterity according to the flesh, but ultimately, to the whole race of Mankind: as appears from that MYSTICK Promise so early made to him as the foundation of all the following, that *in Him should all the Families of the earth be blessed*. These are the two great coincident Truths, to which all these Revelations tend. But the last, the famous *Command* in question, which one would naturally expect to find the confirmation and completion of the rest, hath, if the common Interpreters understand it right, no kind of relation to them, but is entirely foreign to every thing that preceded. Hence we conclude, and surely not unreasonably, that there is something more in the *Command* than these Interpreters, resting in the outside relation, have yet discovered to us.

2. But this is not all. The *Command*, as it hath been hitherto understood, is not only quite disjoined from the rest of Abraham's

* See what hath been said on this subject in the preceding discourse on the xith chapter to the *Hebrews*. † Gen. xv. 6.

history, but likewise occupies a place in it, which, according to our ideas of things, it hath certainly usurped. The *Command* is supposed to be given as a *Trial* only.* Now when the great *Searcher of hearts* is pleased to try any of his Servants, either for example sake, or for some other end favourable of his Dispensations to mankind; as in this, he condescends to the manner of men, who cannot judge of the merits of their inferior Agents without Trial, so we may be assured, he would accommodate himself to their manner likewise, in that which is the material circumstance of a Trial: But, amongst men, the Agent is always tried *before* he be set on work, or rewarded; and not *after:* because the Trial is in order to know, or to make it known, whether he be fit for the work, or deserving of the Reward. When we come therefore to this place, and see a *Command* only to tempt or *try* Abraham, we naturally expect, on his answering to the Trial, to find him importantly employed or greatly rewarded. On the contrary we are told, that this Trial was made after all his Work was done, and all his Reward received—*and it came to pass after these things.*—Nay, what is still more strange, after he had been once *tried* already. For the promise to him, when he was yet childless, his Wife barren, and both of them far advanced in years, that *his seed should be as the stars of Heaven for multitude*, was a Trial of his *faith;* and his believing, against all probability in a natural way, the sacred Historian tells us, was *accounted to him for righteousness.*† Such therefore being the method both of GOD and Men in this matter, we must needs conclude, that the *Command* was not, according to the common notion, *a Trial only*, because it comes *after* all GOD's Dispensations.‡ Yet as the sacred text assures us it was a *Trial;* and as a *Trial* necessarily precedes the employment or reward of the person tried; we must needs conclude, that as no *employment*, so some *benefit* followed this trial. Now, on our interpretation, a *benefit*, as we shall see, did follow: We have reason therefore to conclude that this interpretation is the true.

3. Having seen the difficulties arising from the common interpretation of the Command, let us view it now on the other side; in the new light in which we have adventured to place it. And here we shall find that every circumstance of the Story concurs to support our interpretation. From the view given of Abraham's history, we see, as was said before, how all GOD's revelations to him, to this last, ultimately related to that mystic fundamental promise made to him, on his first Vocation, that *in him should all families of the earth be blessed.* GOD opens the scheme of his Dispensations by exact and regular steps; and the Revelations follow one another gradually

* See note PP, at the end of this book. † Gen. xv. 6. ‡ See note QQ, at the end of this book.

and in order.—Abraham is first commanded to go into a Land which should be shewn to him—then that Land, to be possessed by his numerous posterity, is exhibited before him—Its distinct boundaries are afterwards marked out—He is next assured, while yet childless, that his posterity, to which so much was promised, should not be from an adopted son, but from one out of his own loins—He is then told that his son should be born of Sarah—which is followed by a formal execution of the COVENANT confirmed by the seal of *Circumcision*—After all this, the birth of Isaac is predicted:—who being born at the appointed time, Ishmael is ordered to be sent away; to design with more certainty the succession of the son by Sarah. Here we see throughout, a gradual opening, and fit preparative for some farther Revelation; which, in pursuance of this regular scheme of progressive Dispensations, could be no other than that of the REDEMPTION OF MANKIND BY THE MESSIAH, the completion of the whole Œconomy of Grace, as it only is the explanation of his first and fundamental Promise, *that in Abraham should all the families of the earth be blessed*. But now, the sole remaining revelation of God's Will to Abraham, recorded by the sacred Historian, is the Command to offer up his son Isaac. This COMMAND then, as there is no other that can pretend to be the revelation in question, and as we have shewn it must be somewhere or other recorded in Abraham's story, is the very revelation we seek; which perfects all the foregoing, and makes the whole series complete and uniform. And the place in which we find it is its proper station; for, being the completion of the rest, it must needs be the last in order.

Such, in the *intention* of the Holy Spirit, doth St. CHRYSOSTOM, in his comment on the place, understand it to be.—τὴν δὲ 'HMEPAN ἐνταῦθά μοι δοκεῖ λέγειν τὴν τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἣν ἐν τῇ τοῦ κριοῦ ϖροσφορᾷ καὶ τοῦ 'Ισαὰκ ϖροδιετύπωσε. And in this he is joined or followed by ERASMUS, in his paraphrase. "Hoc ænigmate Jesus significavit, Abraham, quum pararet immolare filium Isaac, per Prophetiæ spiritum vidisse Dominum Jesum in mortem crucis a patre tradendum pro mundi salute."—But these excellent men, not reflecting on that ancient mode of information, where the Inquirer is answered by a significative *action* instead of *speech*, never conceived that this Command was an *imparted* information of that kind, but rather a *typical* representation unsought, and given in an enjoined Rite; of whose import Abraham had then no knowledge.*

4. Again, We find the Revelation of the *redemption of mankind* in that very place where, if considered only in itself, and not relatively, as the completion of the rest, we should, according to all the rules of plain sense, be disposed to seek it. We must know then

* See note RR, at the end of this book.

that this Revelation, as shall be proved from the words of JESUS,—*Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad*, was ardently desired and sought after by the Patriarch. Now the *happiness* or REDEMPTION of mankind promised, on Abraham's first Vocation, to come through him, could not but make him more and more inquisitive into the manner of its being brought about, in proportion as he found himself to be more and more personally concerned as the Instrument of so great a blessing. But every new Revelation would shew him still farther interested in this honour: Therefore, by the time Ishmael was ordered to be sent away, and the *promised Seed* fixed in Isaac, we must needs suppose him very impatient to understand the Mystery of *Redemption;* and so, fitly prepared to receive this last and supreme Revelation. This, in the like cases, we find to be the disposition and state of mind in the holy men of old. Thus Daniel, by the study of the Prophecies of Jeremiah, understanding the approaching restoration of the Jews, applies himself by fasting and prayer for God's further information; and the Angel Gabriel is sent unto him. So John, anxious and solicitous for the suffering Church, being in prayers on the Lord's day, was favoured with all his glorious Revelations.

5. Again, The new light in which this Command is placed, dispels all that perplexity in the common interpretation (taken notice of above) arising from our ideas of a *trial;* where *that* which should in use and reason go before some extraordinary favour, is made to come after all. But now, according to our sense of the *Command*, the trial, as is meet, precedes the last and greatest favour ever bestowed by God on Abraham.

6. To confirm all this, we may consider that this interpretation of the *Command* is most easy and natural, as being intirely agreeable to the ancient way of communicating information. We have shewn * it to have been the general custom of Antiquity, in personal conferences, to instruct by *actions* instead of *words;* a custom begun out of necessity, but continued out of choice, for the superior advantages it hath in making an impression. For *motion*, *naturally* significative, which enters at the eye, hath a much stronger effect than articulate *sound*, only *arbitrarily* significative, which enters at the ear. We have shown likewise, by numerous examples, that God himself vouchsafed, in compliance to a general custom, to use this way of information, when he instructed the holy Patriarchs and Prophets in his Will.

7. Again, As the high importance of this Revelation seemed to require its being given in the strong and forcible way of action,† so nothing can be conceived more apposite to convey the information

* See vol. ii. pp. 185 to 190. † See note SS, at the end of this book.

required than *this very action.* Abraham desired earnestly to be let into the mystery of the REDEMPTION; and GOD, to instruct him (in the best manner humanity is capable of receiving instruction) in the infinite extent of divine goodness to mankind, *who spared not his own son, but delivered him up for us all,** let Abraham feel, by experience, what it was to lose a beloved son;—*Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac;* the Son born miraculously when Sarah was past child-bearing, as Jesus was miraculously born of a pure Virgin. The duration too of the action was the same as that between CHRIST'S Death and Resurrection; both which were designed to be represented in it: and still farther, not only the *final archietypical* Sacrifice of the son of GOD was figured in the *command* to offer Isaac, but the *intermediate Typical* sacrifice, in the Mosaic Œconomy, was represented, by the permitted sacrifice of the Ram offered up instead of Isaac.

8. The last reason I shall offer in support of this point, that the *Command* concerning Isaac was this Revelation of Christ's *day,* or the redemption of mankind by his death and sufferings, is the allusion which Jesus makes (in these words, *Abraham rejoiced to see my day, &c.)* to the following words of Moses, in the history of the command—*And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-jireh: as it is said to this day, In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen.*

To shew that Jesus alluded to these words of Moses, and had them in his eye, when he speaks of *Abraham's rejoicing to see his day,* it will be proper to consider the true force and meaning of either text. The words of Jesus have been fully considered already.†

And, in the words of Moses—*Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-jireh: as it is said to this day, In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen,* we have the assertion of Jesus confirmed, that *Abraham saw Christ's day and was glad.* 1. *Jehovah-jireh* signifies, as several of the best interpreters agree, THE LORD SHALL BE SEEN.‡ But with what propriety could this name be given to it by Abraham, if, in this transaction, he had not *seen* the representation of the Lord's passion, which was to happen in a future age? And if he did see it, how apposite was the name! The Historian goes on—*as it is said to this day, In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen;* or more exactly to the Hebrew—*for he said, In the mount* THE LORD SHALL BE SEEN. In the first part of the verse the sacred Historian tells us

* Rom. viii. 32. † See p. 173, et seq. ‡ "*Dominus videbitur,*" (says the learned Father Houbigant) "1°, Non *videtur,* ne ab futuro verbi aberremus. 2°, Non *videbit,* non modo quia non additur quid sit Deus visurus, sed etiam quia in totâ illâ visione, hominis est *videre,* Domini, *videri;* propter quam causam Deus locum istum mox nomine *visionis* insigniebat. Nimirum Deus Abrahamo id ostendit, quod *Abraham vidit et gavisus est.*" The near relation of these words of Jesus to those of Moses, was too strongly marked to be overlooked by this very judicious Critic, though he considered the transaction in no other light than as a *Type* of the death and passion of Jesus.

that Abraham called the mount, *The Lord shall be seen;* and in the latter part he acquaints us with the manner how Abraham imposed that appellation, namely by the use of a proverbial speech implying the reason of the name.—*To-day in the mount, the Lord shall be seen.** Proverbial speeches, before the general use of recording abstract names and things by writing, being the best and safest conveyance of the memory of events to Posterity. Conformably to this interpretation of the text, the Historian on his entrance on the transaction calls the land of Moriah, to which Abraham went with Isaac (according to Jerome's interpretation), the LAND OF VISION, which shews that the words of Jesus, *Abraham* SAW MY DAY *and was* GLAD, evidently allude to this extraordinary circumstance; namely, the disposition of Abraham's mind on the occasion, expressed in his memorial of a new name imposed on the scene of action; the ancient way of commemorating joyful and happy events. In a word, Jesus says, *Abraham saw his day;* and Abraham, by the name he imposed upon the mount, declares the same thing. But as the VISION was of a public, not of a private nature, he expresses himself in terms which signify what mankind in general *shall see*, not what he himself *had seen*—THE LORD SHALL BE SEEN. From a vague allusion, therefore, of the words of Jesus, to this history of the *command* in general, we have now fixed them to the very words of Moses, to which they more particularly refer.

The sum then of the Argument is this—JESUS expressly says that *Abraham saw, and rejoiced to see, his day*, or the great *Sacrifice* for the sins of mankind by *representation*—The records of sacred History must needs verify his assertion—But there is no place in Scripture which presents the least traces of this Revelation, except the history of the Command to offer Isaac.—This history not only easily and naturally *admits* of such a sense, but even *demands* it—And reciprocally, this sense gives all imaginable light to the History; and removes the greatest difficulties attending the common interpretation of it. Hence, we conclude with certainty, that the *command to*

* "Atque hoc illud est" (says Father Houbigant) "quod memoriæ sempiternæ Abraham consecrabat, cum ita subjungeret, *hodie in monte, Dominus videbitur;* illud *hodie* sic accipiens, ut accepit Paulus Ap. illud Davidis, *hodie si vocem ejus audieritis;* quod *hodie* tamdiu durat, quamdiu sæcula illa durabunt, de quibus Apostolus, *donec hodie cognominatur.* Propterea Abraham non dicit, *hodie Dominus videtur.* Nam id spectaculum nunc solus videt Abraham, postea omnes visuri sunt, et ad omnes pertinebit istud, *videbitur*, generatim dictum, cum omnes Unigenitum *in monte* viderint generis humani victimam factam. Nec aliam sententiam series verborum patitur. Ex qua serie illi deviant, qui hæc verba, *dixit enim hodie in monte dominus*—Mosi sic narranti attribuunt, *propterea dicitur hodie in monte Domini*—quasi renarret Moyses usurpatum sua ætate proverbium. Nam si sic erit, non jam docebit Abraham, cur huic loco nomen fecerit *Dominus videbitur;* quam tamen nominum notationem in sacris paginis non omittunt ii, quicumque nomina rebus imponunt. Quod contra plane docebit Abraham, si de eo Moyses sic narrat, *vocavit nomen loci hujus*, DEUS VIDEBITUR; *nam* dixit, *in monte Deus videbitur.*"

Abraham to offer up his son was only an INFORMATION IN ACTION, which, at Abraham's earnest request, God was graciously pleased to give him, of the *great sacrifice of Christ for the Redemption of mankind.* The thing to be proved. Two great ends seem to be gained by this interpretation: The one, to free the Command from a supposed violation of natural Law; The other, to support the connexion and dependency between the two Revelations; for this interpretation makes the history of the Command a DIRECT Prophecy of Christ as Redeemer of the world; whereas the common brings it, at most, but to a TYPICAL intimation. Now the Defenders* of the common interpretation confess, that the "evidence of *direct* Prophecies is superior to that of *Types.*"

The only plausible Objection which can be made to my explanation, I conceive to be the following—"That what is here supposed the principal and proper reason of the *Command,* is not at all mentioned by the sacred Historian; but another, of a different nature; namely, the Trial of Abraham's faith and obedience.—*And it came to pass after these things, God did tempt Abraham, and said, Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac*—And when the affair is over, the same reason is again insinuated:—*By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not witheld thy son, thine only son, that in blessing I will bless thee,*" *&c.*†

1. To the first part of the Objection I answer, That the knowledge of God's future Dispensation in the redemption of mankind by the death of his Son, revealed, as a singular grace, to the Father of the Faithful, was what could by no means be communicated to the Hebrew People, when Moses wrote this History for their use; because they being then to continue long under a carnal Œconomy, this knowledge, of the END OF THE LAW, would have greatly indisposed them to a Dispensation, with which (as a *Schoolmaster,* that was to bring them by degrees, through a harsh and rugged discipline, to the easy yoke of CHRIST) GOD, in his infinite wisdom, thought fit to exercise them.‡ But he who does not see, from the plain reason of the thing, the necessity of the Historian's silence, is referred, for farther satisfaction, to what hath been already, and will be hereafter said, to evince the necessity of such a conduct, in other momentous points relating to that future Dispensation.

In the mean time, I give him St. Paul's word for this conduct of Moses, who expressly tells us, that he obscured some parts of his history, or put a *veil over his face that the Israelites might not see to the end of that Law which was to be abolished.* And what was that *end,* if not the *Redemption of mankind* by the death and sacrifice of

* DR. STEBBING. † Gen. xxii. 16, 17. ‡ See note TT, at the end of this book.

Christ?—*Moses* (says he) *put a veil over his face, that the Children of Israel could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished. But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away, in the reading of the Old Testament: which veil is done away in* CHRIST.*

But it may be asked, perhaps, "If such Revelations could not be *clearly* recorded, why were they recorded at all?" For a very plain as well as weighty reason; that when the *fulness of time* should come, they might rise up in Evidence against Infidelity, for the real relation and dependency between the two Dispensations of *Moses* and of *Christ*;† when from this, and divers the like instances it should appear, that the *first* Dispensation could be but very imperfectly understood without a reference to the *latter*.

But had not the sacred Writer designedly obscured this illustrious Revelation, by an omission of the attendant circumstances, yet the narrative of such a *converse by action* was not, in its nature, so intelligible or obvious, as that where God is shewn *conversing by action*, to the Prophets, in the several instances formerly given.‡ And the reason is this. Those informations, as they are given to the Prophets for the instruction of the People, have necessarily, in the course of the history, their explanations annexed. But the information to Abraham being solely for his *own private consolation* (as Dr. Scott expresses it above) there was no room for that formal explanation, which made the commanded actions to the Prophets so clear and intelligible.—Yet, as if I had never said this, Dr. Stebbing tells the world, I make this action of Abraham's parallel to those of the Prophets, *whereas* (says he) *it differs from them all in a very material circumstance, as they had their several explanations annexed, and this had not*. But to shew by example, as well as comparison, that obscurity is naturally attendant on the relation of *converse by action*, where the information is for the sake of the Actor only, I shall instance in a case where no obscurity was affected by the Historian. It is the relation of Jacob's wrestling with the Angel.§ The Patriarch, on his return from Haran to his native Country, hearing of his brother Esau's power, and dreading his resentment for the defrauded Birthright, addresses himself for protection in this distress to the GOD of his Fathers, with all humility and confidence. GOD hears his prayer; and is pleased to inform him of the happy issue of the adventure, by a *significative action*: The following night, he has a struggle with an Angel, with whom he is suffered to make his part so good, that from thence he collected GOD had granted his petition.

* 2 Cor. iii. 13, 14. And see note UU, at the end of this book. † See note XX, at the end of this book. ‡ See vol. ii. pp. 185—187. § Gen. xxxii. 24, &c.

This is the circumstance in Jacob's history which affords such mirth to our illiterate Libertines: For this *information by action* concerning only the Actor, who little needed to be told the meaning of a mode of Instruction, at that time in vulgar use, hath now an obscurity which the Scripture-relations of the same mode of information to the Prophets are free from, by reason of their being given for the use of the People, to whom they were explained.

But it may perhaps be asked, "Why, when *the fulness of time was come*, Scripture did not break its long silence, and instruct us in the principal and proper reason of the *Command* to offer Isaac?" I answer, that it has done so. The words of Jesus are a convincing proof. Nay, I might go farther, and say that this is not the only place where the true reason of the *Command* is plainly hinted at. The Author of the epistle to the Hebrews, speaking of this very *Command*, says—*By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac—accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead, from whence also he received him* IN A FIGURE;* ΕΝ ΠΑΡΑΒΟΛΗ, *in a Parable:* a mode of information either by *words* or *actions*, which consists *in putting one thing for another*. Now, in a Writer who regarded this commanded action as a representative information of the Redemption of mankind, nothing could be more fine or easy than this expression. For though Abraham did not indeed receive Isaac restored to life after a real dissolution, yet the Son being in this action to represent CHRIST suffering death for the sins of the world, when the Father brought him safe from mount Moriah after three days, (during which the Son was in a state of condemnation to death) the Father plainly received him, under the character of CHRIST'S Representative, as restored from the dead. For, as his being brought to the mount, there bound, and laid upon the Altar, figured the death and sufferings of CHRIST, so his being taken from thence alive, as properly figured CHRIST'S Resurrection from the dead. With the highest propriety therefore and elegance of speech, might Abraham be said to receive Isaac from the dead *in a parable*, or in representation.† But the nature of the *command* not being understood, these words of the epistle have been hitherto interpreted, to signify only that *Isaac was a type of Christ*, in the same sense that the *old Tabernacle*, in this epistle,‡ is called a *type*—ἥτις ΠΑΡΑΒΟΛΗ, that is, a thing designed by the Holy Spirit to have both a present significancy and a future. Which amounts but just to this, That Abraham receiving Isaac safe from mount Moriah, in the manner related by Scripture, he thereby became a *Type*. An ancient Interpretation, as appears from the reading of the vulgar Latin—*Unde eum et* IN PARABOLAM *accepit*, for *in parabola*, as it

* Heb. xi. 17—19. † See note YY, at the end of this book. ‡ Heb. ix. 9.

ought to have been translated conformably to the Greek. However I desire it may be observed, in corroboration of my sense of the *Command*, that the resemblance to Christ's sacrifice in all the circumstances of the story was so strong that Interpreters could never overlook the resemblance, in their comments on the passage.

2. To the second part of the Objection, I answer thus; It is the office of History to assign the Causes of the facts related. In those facts therefore, which have several Causes, of which the principal cannot be conveniently told, the inferior come in properly to take its place. Thus, in the case before us; though it be made, I presume, very evident that the principal design of the Command was to reveal to Abraham, by *action* instead of *words*, the Redemption of mankind; yet as this was a favour of a very high nature, and conferred on Abraham at his earnest request, it was but fit he should approve himself worthy of it by some proportionable Trial; agreeably to what we find in Scripture to be GOD'S way of dealing with his favoured Servants. On this account, therefore, GOD was pleased, by the very manner in which this Mystery was revealed, to tempt or try Abraham. Where the making the *favour* itself the *trial* of his deserving it, hath all that superior elegance and beauty which is to be conceived in the Dispensations of divine Wisdom only. Now, as the principal reason of the Command could not be conveniently told by the Historian, this inferior one of the *Trial* is assigned with great truth and propriety—*And it came to pass after these things God did tempt Abraham, and said, Take now thy son, &c.* And it is to be observed, that the very manner of recording this reason shews it to be indeed what we suppose it; an inferior one. For it is not said that God gave this Command in order to try Abraham, which expresses a principal reason; but that, in giving the Command, God did try him, which at most only implies an inferior one. We have said, that a Trial, when approved, implied a following reward. Now as there may be more reasons than one for giving a *Command*, so there may be more rewards than one attendant on a *Trial*. Thus it was in the case before us. And it is remarkable that the sacred Historian has observed the same rule with regard to the reward of the Trial as to the reason of the Command. The principal and peculiar reward of Abraham's Trial here was the revelation of the mystery of Redemption: this the Historian could not mention, for the reasons given above: but besides this, GOD rewarded him with a repetition of all the former Promises. This the Historian could, and, in pursuance of the rules of History, does mention:—*By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying, I will multiply thy seed as the stars of Heaven, and as the sand which is upon the*

*sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my voice.**

On the whole, This Objection to the interpretation, the only one I can think of, is so far from obscuring, and weakening, that it adds great light and strength unto it. For admitting the sense here proposed, to be indeed true, we see the Story must of necessity have been told in the very manner we find it to be recorded.†

Before I conclude this part of the Discourse, I shall but just take notice how strongly this interpretation of the Command concludes against the SOCINIANS, for the real *sacrifice* of CHRIST, and the proper *Redemption* of mankind. For if the Command was an information by *action* instead of *words*, the proof conveyed in it is decisive; there being here no room for their evasion of its being a *figurative expression*, since the *figurative action*, the original of such expression, denotes either a *real sacrifice*, or nothing at all.

II.

I come now to the other part of this Discourse, viz. to shew, that the interpretation here given intirely dissipates all those blustering objections which Infidelity hath raised up against the historic truth of the relation.

They say, "GOD could not give such a Command to Abraham, because it would throw him into inextricable doubts concerning the Author of it, as Whether it proceeded from a good or an evil Being. Or if not so, but that he might be satisfied it came from GOD, it would then mislead him in his notions of the divine Attributes, and of the fundamental principles of Morality. Because, though the revocation of the Command prevented the homicide, yet the species of the action commanded not being condemned when it was revoked, Abraham and his Family must needs have thought HUMAN SACRIFICES grateful to the Almighty: for a simple revoking was not condemning; but would be more naturally thought a peculiar indulgence for a ready obedience. Thus, the Pagan fable of Diana's substituting a Hind in the place of Iphigenia did not make Idolaters believe that she therefore abhorred *Human Sacrifices*, they having before been persuaded of the contrary, from the Command of that Idol to offer up the daughter of Agamemnon."—This is the substance, only set in a clearer light, of all their dull cloudy dissertations on the case of Abraham.‡

1. Let us see then how the case stood: GOD had been pleased to reveal to him his eternal purpose of making all mankind blessed through him: and likewise to confirm this promise, in a regular course

* Gen. xxii. 16, et seq. † See note ZZ, at the end of this book. ‡ See note AAA, at the end of this book.

of successive Revelations, each fuller and more explicit than the other. By this time we cannot but suppose the *Father of the Faithful* must, from the nature of the thing, be become very desirous of knowing the manner how this Blessing was to be brought about: A Mystery, if we will believe the Author of our Faith, that engaged the attention of other holy men, less immediately concerned than Abraham, and consequently less stimulated and excited by their curiosity:—*And* JESUS *turned to his Disciples, and said privately, Blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see. For I tell you that many Prophets and Kings have* DESIRED *to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them, and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them.** But we are assured, by the same authority, that Abraham had, in fact, this very *desire* highly raised in him: *Abraham rejoiced to see my day* (says JESUS), *and he saw it, and was glad;* or rather, He rejoiced THAT HE MIGHT SEE, INA IΔHι; which implies, that the period of his joy was in the space between the promise made, and the actual performance of it by the delivery of the Command; consequently, that it was granted at his earnest request.† In the second place, we shall shew from the same words, that Abraham, at the time when the Command was given, KNEW it to be that Revelation he had so earnestly requested. This is of the highest importance for the understanding the true nature of the Command.—*Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my Day, and he saw it, and was glad.* Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἠγαλλιάσατο INA IΔHι τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμὴν· καὶ εἶδε, καὶ ἐχάρη. We have observed that ἵνα ἴδῃ, in strict propriety, signifies *that he might see.* The English phrase,—*to see,* is equivocal and ambiguous, and means either the present time, *that he then did see;* or the future, *that he was promised he should see:* but the original ἵνα ἴδῃ has only the latter sense. So that the text plainly distinguishes two different periods of Joy; the first, when *it was promised he should see;* the second, when *he actually saw:* And it is to be observed‡ that, according to the exact use of the words, in ἀγαλλιάομαι is implied the tumultuous pleasure which the certain expectation of an approaching blessing, understood only in the gross, occasions; and, in χαίρω that calm and settled joy which arises from our knowledge, in the possession of it. But the Translators, perhaps, not apprehending that there was any time between the *Grant to see,* and the *actual seeing,* turned it, *he rejoiced to see;* as if it had been the Paraphrase of the Poet Nonnus,

ἰδεῖν ἠγάλλετο θυμῷ.

whereas this History of Abraham hath plainly three distinct periods.

* Luke x. 23, 24. † Thus all the *Eastern* Versions understand it: "Cupidus fuit videndi."—*Syriac.* "Cupidus erat ut videret."—*Persic.* "Exoptavit videre."—*Arab.* "Desideravit, gavisus est ut videret."—*Æthiop.* ‡ See note BBB, at the end of this book.

The first contains GOD's promise to grant Abraham's request, when he *rejoiced that he should see;* this, for reasons given above, was wisely omitted by the Historian: Within the second period was the delivery of the *Command,* with which Moses's account begins: And Abraham's Obedience, through which he *saw* CHRIST'S *day and was glad,* includes the third.* Thus the Patriarch, we find, had a promise that his request should be granted; and, in regard to that promise, an *action* is commanded, which, at that time, was a common mode of information; Abraham therefore must needs know it was the very information so much requested, so graciously promised, and so impatiently expected. We conclude then, on the whole, that this *Command* being only the Grant of an earnest request, and known by Abraham, at the time of imposing, to be such Grant, he could not possibly have any doubt concerning the Author of it. He was soliciting the God of Heaven to reveal to him the Mystery of Man's Redemption, and he received the information, in a Command to offer Isaac; a Revelation, that had the closest connection with, and was the fullest completion of, the whole series of the preceding Revelations.

2. For, (as we shall now shew, in answer to the second part of the objection) the *Command* could occasion no mistakes concerning the divine Attributes; it being, as was said, only the conveyance of an information by *action* instead of *words,* in conformity to the common mode of converse in the more early times. This *action* therefore being mere scenery, had NO MORAL IMPORT; that is, it conveyed or implied none of those *intentions* in him who commanded it, and in him who obeyed the Command, which go along with actions that have a *moral import.*† Consequently the *injunction* and *obedience,* in an action which hath no such import, can no way affect the moral character of the persons concerned: and consequently, this Command could occasion no mistakes concerning the divine Attributes, with regard to God's delighting in human sacrifices. On the contrary, the very information conveyed by it, was the highest assurance to the person informed, of God's good-will towards man. Hence we see there was not the least occasion, when GOD *remitted* the offering of Isaac, that he should *formally condemn human Sacrifices,* to prevent Abraham or his family's falling into an opinion, that such Sacrifices were not displeasing to him,‡ any more than for the Prophet Ahijah,§ when he

* See note CCC, at the end of this book. † See note DDD, at the end of this book. ‡ See note EEE, at the end of this book. § "And it came to pass at that time, when Jeroboam went out of Jerusalem, that the Prophet Ahijah the Shilonite found him in the way; and he had clad himself with a new garment, and they two were alone in the field. And Ahijah caught the new garment that was on him, and rent it in twelve pieces, and he said to Jeroboam, Take thee ten pieces, for thus saith the Lord the God of Israel, Behold I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give ten tribes to thee." (1 Kings xi. 29—31.) The circumstance of the *new garment* was not insignificant: It was to denote the power of the kingdom at that time in its full strength and lustre.

had rent Jeroboam's garment into twelve pieces to denote the ensuing division in the tribes of Israel, to deliver a moral precept against the sin of despoiling and insulting our neighbour: For the command having *no moral import*, as being only an information by action, where one thing stood for the representative of another, all the consequence that could be deduced from it was only this, that the Son of GOD should be offered up for the sins of mankind: therefore the conceptions they had of HUMAN SACRIFICES, *after the command*, must needs be just the same with those they had *before;* and therefore, instruction, concerning the execrable nature of this Rite, was not only needless, but altogether beside the question.

But this assertion that a SCENICAL REPRESENTATION HAS NO MORAL IMPORT, having been misunderstood by many, and misrepresented by more, (though nothing, as I then thought, could be clearer to men versed in moral matters) I shall beg leave to explain myself.—He who affirms that *a scenical representation has no moral import*, cannot possibly be understood to mean (if interpreted on the ordinary rules of Logic and Common sense) any thing else than that the representation or the feigned action has none of that *specific morality* which is in the real action. He can never be supposed to mean that such a representation could never, even by accident, give birth to a moral entity, of a different species; though it kept within, much less if it transgressed the bounds, of its scenical nature. Give me leave to explain this by an instance or two. The tragic scene we will suppose to exhibit a Pagan story, in which a lewd Sacrifice to Venus is represented. Now I say this scenical representation has *no moral import*. But do I mean by this, that there was no immorality of any kind in the scene? Far from it. I only mean that that *specific immorality* was absent, which would have existed there, had the action been real and not feigned; I mean *idolatry*. Again, another set of Tragedians represent the Conspiracy against Julius Cæsar in the Senate-house. This, I say, has *no moral import:* for neither could the followers of Cæsar's Cause call these fictitious Conspirators, enemies to their Country; nor could the warmest lovers of liberty call them Patriots. But if in this representation, the Actors, instead of exhibiting an imaginary assassination, should commit a real one, on the body of the personated Cæsar, Who ever supposed that such a dramatic representation continued still to have *no moral import?* The men who committed the action dropped their personated, and assumed their real character, being instigated by interest, malice, or revenge; and only waited a fit opportunity to perpetrate their designs under the cover of a drama. Here indeed, the parallel ceases. The feigned Conspirators transgressed the bounds of a representation: while the real death of Isaac must be supposed to make

part of the scenical representation, in the Command to Abraham. But it should have been considered, and was not, that I employed the principle of a *feigned representation's having no moral import*, to free the *Command* from the infidel objection that it was *an enjoined sacrifice;* not from the objection of its being *an enjoined death, simply:* For a *human Sacrifice commanded* was supposed to discredit Revelation, as giving too much countenance and encouragement to that horrid superstition; whereas, with regard to *a simple death commanded*, to justify this, I was ready to confide in the common argument of Divines, taken from God's sovereign right over his creatures: Whose power could instantaneously repair the loss, or whose goodness would abundantly reward the act of obedience. Yet the fair and candid Dr. Rutherforth represents my position of *a scenical representation's having no moral import*, to be the same with saying, that *though an action be ever so vile in itself, yet, if it be done to represent somewhat else, it loses its nature and becomes an indifferent one.*—Had I the presumption to believe, that any thing I could say would better his heart or mend his head, I should recommend what hath been here said to his serious consideration.

3. And now we see the weakness of the third and last part of the Objection, which supposes this Command capable of affording a temptation to transgress the fundamental principles of the Law of Nature: one of which obliges us to cherish and protect our Offspring; and another, not to injure our Neighbour. For as, by the *Command*, Abraham understood the nature of man's Redemption; so, by the nature of that Redemption, he must know how the scenical representation was to end. Isaac, he saw, was made the person or representative of *Christ dying for us:* The Son of GOD, he knew, could not possibly lie under the *dominion of the grave.* Hence he must needs conclude one of these two things, either that GOD would stop his hand when he came to give the sacrificing stroke: or that, if the Revelation of this mystery was to be represented throughout in action, that then his Son, sacrificed under the person of CHRIST, was, under the same person, soon to be restored to life: *accounting* (as he well might) *that God was able to raise him up even from the dead*, as the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews,* who seems to have been full of the idea here explained, assures us he did believe.

Now where was the temptation to violate any Principle of Morality in all this? The Law of Nature commands us to cherish and protect our offspring: Was that transgressed in giving a stroke whose hurt was presently to be repaired? Surely no more than if the stroke had been in vision. The Law of Nature forbids all injury to our Fellow-creature: And was he injured, who, by being thus highly honoured,

* Heb. xi. 19.

in becoming the representative of the Son of God, was to share with his Father Abraham in the rewards of his obedience? But though, as we see, Abraham could have no struggles with himself, from any doubts that he might violate Morality in paying obedience to the Command; yet did the merit of that obedience, where the natural feelings were so alarmed, deserve all the encomiums bestowed upon it in Holy Writ. For, in expressing his extreme readiness to obey, he declared a full confidence in the promises of GOD.

From hence we may deduce these two corollaries.

1. That the noble Author of *the Characteristics* hath shewn as much ignorance as malevolence, when he supposed that Abraham's shewing no *extreme surprise on this trying Revelation* was from the favourable notion he had of Human Sacrifices, *so common amongst the inhabitants of Palestine and other neighbouring Nations.** For we see the reason, why Abraham, instead of being under any *extreme surprise*, was (as JESUS assures us) under an *extreme joy*, was because he understood the *Command* to be a communication of that Mystery in which he had so earnestly requested to participate; and, consequently, that Isaac must needs, at length, come safe and unhurt from that scenical representation, in which he bore the principal part.

2. That Sir John Marsham's suspicion of Abraham's being struck by a superstitious imagination † is as groundless, as it is injurious to the holy Patriarch. Nay, the very examples he gives might have shewn him the folly of such insinuations: For, according to his inferences, Human Sacrifices were never offered but in cases of great distress: Now Abraham was at this time in a full state of peace, security, and affluence.

Thus, we presume, it appears that this *Command* was a mere *information by action:* and that, when regarded in this view, all the objections against GOD's giving it to Abraham are absolutely enervated and overthrown.

For thus stands the case. If the trial of Abraham's faith and obedience were the commanding a real sacrifice, then was Abraham an *Agent*, and not a bare *Instrument;* and then it might be pretended that God commanded an human *agent* to act against humanity. And his right over his Creatures cannot solve the difficulty, as it may when he employs a mere instrument to perform his Will upon them. But if the trial were only the commanding a scenical representation, the

* See note FFF, at the end of this book. † "*Ex istis satius est colligere hanc Abrahami tentationem non fuisse* κεκαινουργημένην πρᾶξιν, *actionem innovatam; non recens excogitatam, sed ad pristinos Cananæorum mores designatam. Horrendi sacrificii usum apud Phœnices frequentem indicat Porphyrius:* 'Phœnices,' *inquit*, 'in magnis periculis ex bello, fame, pestilentia, clarissimorum aliquem ad id suffragiis publicis delectum, sacrificabant Saturno. Et victimarum talium plena est Sanchoniathonis historia Phœnicice scripta, quam Philo Biblius Græce interpretatus est libris octo.'"—*Canon. Chron.* p. 79.

command had *no moral import;* and consequently Abraham was not put upon any thing morally wrong; as is the offering up a human sacrifice.

I have transcribed into the notes, as I have gone along, some of the most considerable Objections my Adversaries have been able to oppose to this interpretation of the COMMAND TO ABRAHAM: which, I presume, when fairly considered, will be no light confirmation of it. But, as I have no notions to advance, not founded in a sincere desire to find out, and do honour to, Truth, I would by no means take advantage of an Adversary's weakness to recommend them to the public favour. I hold it not honest, therefore, to conceal the force of an Objection which I myself have to offer, by far more plausible than any that these learned Divines have urged against it. The objection is this, "That it is difficult to conceive why a CIRCUMSTANCE of such importance to Revelation, which removes one of the strongest arguments against its truth, and at the same time manifests a REAL CONNEXION between the two Dispensations of it, should never be directly and minutely explained and insisted on by the Writers of the New Testament, though Abraham's Historian might have had his reasons for concealing it." Now, to my own Objection, I suppose, I may have leave to reply, That many truths of great importance, for the support of Religion against Infidelity, were taught by Jesus to his Disciples (amongst which, I reckon *this Interpretation* to be one) which never came down, by their conveyance, to the Church. But being, by the assistance of God's Holy Spirit, discoverable by those who devote themselves to the study of the Scriptures with a pure mind, have, for the wise ends of Providence (many of which are inscrutable to us) been left for the industry of men to find out: that, as occasion required, every Age might supply new evidence of God's Truth, to *put to silence the ignorance of foolish men:* and in proportion as the Powers of Darkness prevailed, so might the Gospel-light break out again with fresh splendor to curb and repress them. In support of what is here said, I beg the Reader to reflect on what is told us by the Evangelist, of the conversation between JESUS (after his Resurrection) and the two Disciples journeying to Emmaus; where their Master says unto them, *O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken! Ought not* Christ *to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at* MOSES, *and all the Prophets,* HE EXPOUNDED UNTO THEM *the things concerning himself.** Now, who can doubt but that many things were at this time revealed, which, had they been delivered down to Posterity, in Writing, would have greatly contributed to the improvement of Eusebius's *Evangelical Demonstration?* Yet hath Providence thought

* Luke xxiv. 25—27.

fit to order matters otherwise. But, that the Apostles used, and made a good use too, of those EXPOSITIONS, long since forgotten and lost, we have great reason to believe from their amazing success in the conversion of the world, by such an application of *Moses and the Prophets, to Christ.* And if I be not much deceived, amongst the Truths thus inforced, *that,* which I presume to have discovered in the *Command to Abraham,* held no inferior place. Let the unprejudiced Reader judge. St. PAUL, making his Apology before king Agrippa, concludes his Defence in these words: *Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the Prophets and* MOSES DID SAY SHOULD COME: *that* CHRIST *should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead.** The *Greek* is rather stronger, in predicating this circumstance of Moses,—ὧν τε οἱ προφῆται ἐλάλησαν μελλόντων γίνεσθαι, ΚΑΙ ΜΩΣΗΣ. Now where, let me ask, in all his Writings, but in the *Command to Abraham,* is there the least trace of any such circumstance, as *that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead?* Nor is it to be found there, unless the *Command* be understood in the sense I have given to it.—

But this is the state in which it hath pleased Providence to place the Church of Christ: With abundant evidence in hand, to support itself against the attacks of Infidelity; yet much of this divine Treasure left sealed up, to exercise our *Faith,* and (in time of need) to excite our *Industry:* for it was not the intent of Providence that one of these virtues should thrive at the expence of the other; but that Industry should as well be rewarded by a successful search, as Faith, by *peace in believing.* Therefore when my learned Adversary,† in order, I will believe, to advance the Christian Faith, would discourage Christian Industry, by calumniating, and rendering suspected what he is pleased to call EXPERIMENTS in Religion, it is, I am afraid, at best but a *Zeal without knowledge.* Indeed, M. Pascal ascribes this contempt of *experiments* to a different cause.—"Ceux qui sont capables de inventer sont rares," says he. "Ceux qui n'inventent point sont en plus grand nombre, et par consequent, les plus fortes; et voila pourquoi, lors que les Inventeurs cherchent la gloire qu'ils meritent, tout ce qu'ils y gagnent, c'est qu'on les traite de VISIONNAIRES." It is true, if men will come to the study of Scripture with unwashen hands, that is, without a due reverence for the dignity of those sacred Volumes, or, which is as ill, with unpurged heads, that is, heads stuffed with bigot-systems, or made giddy with cabalistic flights, they will deserve that title which Pascal observes is so unjustly given to those who deserve best of the Public.

* Acts xxvi. 22, 23; and to the same purpose, Acts xiii. 31. † DR. STEBBING.

But to return to those with whom I have principal concern. I make no question but my Freethinking Adversaries, to whose temper and talents I am no stranger, will be ready to object,

I. "That the giving a solution of a difficulty in the *Old* Testament by the assistance of the *New*, considered together as making up one intire Dispensation, is an unfair way of arguing against an Unbeliever: who supposing both the Jewish and Christian Religions to be *false*, of consequence supposes them to be *independent* on one another; and that this pretended relation was a contrivance of the Authors of the later imposture to give it strength, by ingrafting the young shoot into the trunk of an old flourishing Superstition. Therefore, will they say, if we would argue with success against them, we must seek a solution of their difficulties in that Religion alone, from which they arise."—Thus I may suppose them to argue. And I apprehend they will have no reason to say I have put worse arguments into their mouths than they are accustomed to employ against Revelation.

I reply then, that it will admit of no dispute, but that, if they may have the liberty of turning JUDAISM and CHRISTIANITY into two Fantoms of their own devising, they will have a very easy victory over Both. This is an old trick, and has been often tried with success. By this slight-of-hand conveyance TYNDAL hath juggled fools out of their Religion. For, in a well-known book written by him against Revelation, he hath taken advantage of the indiscretion of some late Divines to lay it down as a Principle, *that Christianity is* ONLY *a republication of the Religion of Nature:* The consequence of which is, that CHRISTIANITY and JUDAISM are *independent* Institutions. But sure the Deist is not to obtrude his own Inventions, in the place of those Religions he endeavours to overthrow. Much less is he to *beg the question* of their falsity; as the laying it down that the Jewish and Christian are two *independent* Religions, certainly is: because Christianity claims many of its numerous Titles to divinity from and under Judaism. If therefore Deists will not, yet Christians of necessity must take their Religion as they find it. And if they will remove objections to either Œconomy, they must reason on the Principle of *Dependency*. And while they do so, their reasonings will not only be fair and logical, but every solution, on such a Principle, will, besides its determination on the particular point in question, be a new proof of the divinity of Both, in general; because such a relation, connexion, and dependency between two Religions of so distant times, could not come about by chance, or by human contrivance, but must needs be the effect of Divine provision. For a Deist, therefore, to bid us remove his objections on the principle of *independency*, is to bid us prove our religion *true* on a principle that implies its *falshood;* the New Testament giving us no other idea of Christianity than as of

a Religion dependent on, connected with, and the completion of Judaism.

But now suppose us to be in this excess of complaisance for our Adversaries; and then see whether the ingenuity of their acceptance would not equal the reasonableness of their demand. Without doubt, were we once so foolish to swallow their Chimeras for the heavenly Manna of Revelation, we should have them amongst the first to cry out upon the prevarication. I speak not this at random. The fact hath already happened. Certain advocates of Religion, unable to reconcile to their notions of logic, the sense of some Prophecies in the Old Testament, as explained in the *applications* of the Writers of the New, thought it best to throw aside the care of the JEWISH RELIGION, (a burden which they could as ill bear as the rebellious Israelites themselves) and try to support the CHRISTIAN, by proving its divine Original, independently and from itself alone. Upon this Mr. COLLINS (for I have chosen to instance in these two general dealers in Free-thinking; the small retailers of it vanishing as fast as they appear; for who now talks of *Blount* or *Coward?* or who hereafter will talk of *Strutt* or *Morgan?)* * that the world may see how little they agreed about their own principles, or rather how little regard they paid to any principles at all; Mr. Collins, I say, wrote a book to exclaim against our ill faith; and to remind us of, and to prove to us, the inseparable connexion between the Old and New Testament. This was no unseasonable reproof, howsoever intended, for so egregious a folly. I will endeavour to profit by it; and manage this Controversy on their own terms. For whatever prevarication appeared in the Objectors, I conceived they had demanded no more than what they might reasonably expect. But the advantages arising to us from this management soon made them draw back, and retract what they had demanded; and now they chicane with us for calling in the assistance of the New Testament to repel their attacks upon the Old; † while, at the same time, they think themselves at liberty to use the assistance of the Old to overthrow the New. Let the Friends of Revelation, however, constantly and uniformly hold the inseparable connexion between the two Dispensations; and then, let our Enemies, if they will, as they fairly may, take all the advantages they fancy they have against us, from the necessity we lie under of so doing.

In a word, We give them Judaism and Christianity as Religions equally from Heaven; with that reciprocal dependence on each other which arises between two things bearing the mutual relation of *foundation* and *superstructure*. They have it in their choice to oppose our pretensions, either by disputing with us that dependency, or raising

* See note GGG, at the end of this book. † See note HHH, at the end of this book.

difficulties on the foot of it. But while they only *suppose* it visionary; and then argue against each Religion on that supposition, they only beg the question. And while they do that, we keep within the rules of good logic, when we remove their objections on that principle of *dependency* laid down in Scripture. This restrictive rule of interpretation being however still observed, That, in explaining any difficulty in the Old Testament, we never, on pretence of such *dependency*, forsake the genius and manners of the times in question, and serve ourselves of those of the later Christian period, as Collins (whether truly or no, let Them look to, who are concerned in it) upbraids some defenders of Christianity for doing. This rule is here, I presume, observed with sufficient exactness; the foundation of my interpretation of the *Command* being that ancient mode of converse, so much at that time in use, of *conversing by actions*.

II. But the Adversaries of Revelation, how easily soever they may be confuted, are not so easily silenced. They are ready to object, that we fly to the old exploded refuge of a TYPE, which the Author of *the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion* hath shewn to be *visionary* and *senseless;* the mere illogical whimsy of Cabalistic Jews. To this I answer,

1. They are doubly mistaken. This interpretation is not founded in any *typical* sense whatsoever; the person of Isaac on the Mount being no more a *Type* of Christ than the six letters that compose the name are a *Type* of him; but only an arbitrary mark to stand for the idea of *Christ*, as that word does. So that their cry against *Types*, whatever force it may have, does not at all affect this interpretation.

2. But, secondly, I say, A TYPE is neither *visionary*, nor *senseless*, notwithstanding the disgrace which this mode of information hath undergone by the mad abuses of Fanaticism and Superstition. On the contrary, I hold it to be a just and reasonable manner of denoting one thing by another: not the creature of the imagination, made out of nothing to serve a turn; but as natural and apposite a figure as any employed in human converse. For *Types* arose from that original mode of communication, the *conversing by actions:* the difference there is between these two modes of information being only this, that, where the action is *simply significative*, it has *no moral import:* For example, when Ezekiel is bid to *shave his beard, to weigh the hair in balances, to divide it into three parts, to burn one, to strike another with a knife, and to scatter the third part in the wind,** this action having *no moral import* is merely *significative* of information given. But when the Israelites are commanded to take a *male lamb without blemish, and the whole assembly of the congregation to kill it, and to sprinkle the blood upon the door-posts,*† this action having a *moral*

* Ezek. v. 1, 2. † Exod. xii. 5—7.

import as being a religious Rite, and, at the same time, representative of something future, is properly *typical*. Hence arose the mistake of the interpreters of the *Command* to offer Isaac. These men supposing the action commanded to have a *moral import*, as being only for a trial of Abraham's faith; and, at the same time, seeing in it the most exact resemblance of the death of CHRIST, very wrongly concluded that action to be *typical* which was merely *significative*: and by this means, leaving in the action a *moral import*, subjected it to all those cavils of infidelity, which, by taking away all *moral import*, as not belonging to it, are here entirely evaded.

But it being of the highest importance to Revelation in general, and not a little conducive to the support of our arguments for the Divine Legation of Moses in particular, to shew the logical truth and propriety of *Types* in *action*, and *Secondary senses* in *speech*, I shall take the present opportunity to sift this matter to the bottom. For having occasionally shewn, in several parts of the preceding Discourse, that the references in the LAW to the GOSPEL are in *typical representations*, and *secondary senses*; and the truth of Christianity depending on the real relation (which is to be discovered by such references) between the two Dispensations, it will be incumbent on me to prove the logical truth and propriety of TYPES in action, and SECONDARY SENSES in speech.

And I enter on this subject with the greater pleasure, as one of the most plausible books ever written, or likely to be written, against Christianity is intirely levelled at them. In this enquiry I shall pursue the same method I have hitherto taken with unbelieving Writers; examine only the grounds and principles on which they go; and having removed and overthrown these, in as few words as I am able, leave the superstructure to support itself, as it may.

SECTION VI.

THE book I speak of is intitled, "A Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion," written, as is generally supposed, by Mr. Collins; a Writer, whose dexterity in the arts of Controversy was so remarkably contrasted by his abilities in reasoning and literature, as to be ever putting one in mind of what travellers tell us of the genius of the proper Indians, who, although the veriest bunglers in all the fine arts of manual operation, yet excel everybody in slight of hand and the delusive feats of activity.

The purpose of his book is to prove that JESUS was an impostor: and his grand argument stands thus,—"JESUS" (as he shews) "claims under the promised Messiah of the Jews; and proposes himself as the Deliverer prophesied of in their sacred Books; yet" (as he attempts to shew) "none of these Prophecies can be understood of JESUS but in

a *secondary sense* only; now a secondary sense" (as he pretends) "is fanatical, chimerical, and contrary to all scholastic rules of interpretation: Consequently, JESUS not being prophesied of in the Jewish Writings, his pretensions are false and groundless."—His conclusion, the reader sees, stands on the joint support of these two Propositions, *That there is no Jewish Prophecy which relates to* JESUS *in a primary sense;* and *That a secondary sense is enthusiastical and unscholastic.* If either of these fail, his phantom of a conclusion sinks again into nothing.

Though I shall not omit occasionally to confute the first, yet it is the falshood of the second I am principally concerned to expose—That there are Jewish prophecies which relate to JESUS in their direct and primary sense, hath been proved with much force of reason and learning; But, that *secondary Prophecies are not enthusiastical and unscholastic,* hath not been shewn and insisted on, by the Writers on this question, with the same advantage. The truth is, the nature of a DOUBLE SENSE in Prophecies hath been so little seen or enquired into, that some Divines, who agree in nothing else, have yet agreed to second this assertion of Mr. Collins, and with the same frankness and confidence to pronounce that a *double sense* is indeed enthusiastical and unscholastic. To put a stop therefore to this growing evil, sown first by SOCINUS, and since become so pestilent to Revelation, is not amongst the last purposes of the following discourse.

I. It hath been shewn, that one of the most ancient and simple Modes of human converse was communicating the conceptions by an expressive ACTION. As this was of familiar use in Civil matters, it was natural to carry it into Religious. Hence, we see God giving his instructions to the Prophet, and the Prophet delivering God's commands to the People in this very manner. Thus far the nature of the action, both in civil and religious matters, is exactly the same.

But in Religion it sometimes happens that a STANDING Information is necessary, and there the Action must be continually repeated: This is done by holding out the particular Truth (thus to be preserved) in a religious *Rite.* Here then the Action begins to change its nature; and, from a mere significative mark, of only *arbitrary import* like words or letters, becomes an action of *moral import,* and acquires the new name of TYPE. Thus GOD, intending to record the future sacrifice of CHRIST in Action, did it by the periodic Sacrifice of a *lamb without blemish.* This was not *merely* and so DIRECTLY *significative* of CHRIST (like the Command to Abraham); but being a religious Rite, and so having a *moral import,* it was *typical,* though NOT DIRECTLY *significative,* of him. The very same may be said of the Temporal rewards of the Law; they were properly *typical* of the

Spiritual rewards of the Gospel, and had a *moral import* of their own, as being the real sanction of the Law.

Again, It hath been shewn,* how, in the gradual cultivation of Speech, the expression by *Action* was improved and refined into an ALLEGORY or *Parable ;* in which the words carry a double meaning; having, besides their obvious sense which serves only for the Envelope, one more material, and hidden. With this figure of speech all the moral writings of Antiquity abound. But when this figure is transferred from Civil use to Religious, and employed in the writings of inspired Men, to convey information of particular circumstances in two distinct Dispensations, to a people who had an equal concern in both, it is then what we call a DOUBLE SENSE ; and undergoes the very same change of its nature that an *expressive action* underwent when converted into a *Type;* that is, both the meanings, in the DOUBLE SENSE, are of *moral import;* whereas in the *Allegory,* one only of the meanings is so: And this (which arises out of the very nature of their conversion, from Civil to Religious matters) is the only difference between *expressive actions* and TYPES : and between *allegories* and DOUBLE SENSES.

From hence it appears, that as TYPES are only religious *expressive Actions,* and DOUBLE SENSES only religious *Allegories,* and neither receive any change but what the very manner of bringing those *Civil* figures into *Religion* necessarily induces, they must needs have, in this their tralatitious state, the same LOGICAL FITNESS they had in their natural.† Therefore as *expressive Actions,* and *Allegories,* in Civil discourses, are esteemed proper and reasonable modes of information, so must TYPES and DOUBLE SENSES in Religious ; for the end of both is the same, namely, COMMUNICATION OF KNOWLEDGE. The consequence of this is, that Mr. Collins's proposition, that *a secondary or double sense is enthusiastical and unscholastic* (the necessary support of his grand Argument) is entirely overthrown.

This is the true and simple origin of TYPES and DOUBLE SENSES: which our Adversaries, through ignorance of the rise and progress of Speech, and unacquaintance with ancient Manners, have insolently treated as the issue of distempered brains, and the fondlings of Visionaries and Enthusiasts.

II. Having thus shewn their *logical propriety,* or that they are rational Modes of information, I come now to vindicate their *Religious use,* and to shew that they are well suited to *that* Religion in which we find them employed. An Objection which, I conceive, may be made to this use, will lead us naturally into our Argument. The objection is this : "It hath been shewn,‡ that these oblique Modes

* In the second volume, pp. 201, et seq. † See note III, at the end of this book.
‡ In the present volume, p. 3, et seq.

of converse, though at first invented out of *necessity*, for general information, were employed, at length, to a *mysterious secretion of knowledge;* which though it might be expedient, useful, and even necessary both in CIVIL MATTERS and in FALSE RELIGION, could never be so in MORAL MATTERS, and in THE TRUE RELIGION; for this having nothing to hide from any of its followers, *Types* and *Double senses* (the same mysterious conveyance of knowledge in Sacred matters, which *Allegoric words* or *Actions* are in Civil) were altogether unfit to be employed in it."

To this I answer, The JEWISH RELIGION, in which these *Types* and *Secondary senses* are to be found, was given to one single People only; just as the CHRISTIAN is offered to all Mankind: Now the Christian, as Mr. Collins * himself labours to prove, professes to be grounded on the Jewish. If therefore Christianity was not only professedly, but really grounded on Judaism (and the supposition is strictly logical in a defence of *Types* and *Double senses*, whose reality depends on the reality of that relation) then Judaism was *preparatory* to Christianity, and Christianity the *ultimate end* of Judaism: But it is not to be supposed that there should be an intire *silence* concerning this ultimate Religion during the preparatory, when the *notice* of it was not only highly proper, but very expedient: 1. first, to draw those under the preparatory Religion, by just degrees to the ultimate; a provision the more necessary, as the nature and genius of the two Religions were different, the one carnal, the other spiritual: 2. secondly, to afford convincing evidence to future Ages of the truth of that Ultimate Religion; which evidence, a circumstantial prediction of its advent and nature so long before hand, effectually does afford.† The Ultimate Religion therefore must have had some notice given of it, in the Preparatory: and nothing was better fitted for this purpose than the hyperbolical genius of the Eastern Speech. Thus, when Isaiah says, *Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder: And his name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace*, Mr. Collins observes, it is the eastern hyperbole which prevents our seeing that a Jewish Monarch is literally and directly spoken of. Should we allow this, yet we still see, that such a language was admirably fitted to connect together the *first* and

* "*Christianity* is founded on *Judaism*, and the New Testament on the Old; and JESUS is the person said in the New Testament to be promised in the Old, under the character of the MESSIAH of the *Jews*, who, as such only, claims the obedience and submission of the world. Accordingly it is the design of the authors of the *New*, to prove all the parts of *Christianity* from the Old Testament, which is said to contain *the words of eternal life*, and to represent JESUS and his apostles as *fulfilling* by their mission, doctrines, and works, the predictions of the *Prophets*, the historical parts of the Old Testament, and the Jewish Law; which last is expressly said to *prophesy* of, or *testify* Christianity."—"Grounds and Reasons," &c. pp. 4, 5. † See note KKK, at the end of this book.

second Senses: the *hyperbole* becoming a *simple speech*, when transferred from a Jewish Monarch to the monarch of the world.

Our next inquiry will be, *in what manner* this notice must needs be given. Now the nature of the thing shews us it could not be directly and openly; so as to be understood by the People, at the time of giving: because this would have defeated GOD's intermediate purpose; which was to train them, by a long discipline, under his preparatory Dispensation. For, this being a Religion founded only on *temporal Sanctions*, and burdened with a *minute and tiresome Ritual*, had the People known it to be only preparatory to another, founded on *better Promises* and easier Observances, they would never have born the yoke of the Law, but would have shaken off their subjection to Moses before the *fulness of Time* had brought their spiritual Deliverer amongst them; as, without this knowledge, they were but too apt to do, on every imaginary prospect of advantage. But St. CHRYSOSTOM will inforce this observation with more advantage. "Had the Jews" (says he) "been taught from the beginning that their Law was temporary and to have an end, they would have certainly despised it. On this account, it seemed good to the divine Wisdom to throw a veil of obscurity over the Prophecies which related to the Christian Dispensation."* This information, therefore, was to be delivered with caution; and conveyed under the covert language of their present Œconomy. Hence arose the fit and necessary use of TYPES and SECONDARY SENSES. For the only safe and lasting means of conveyance were their PUBLIC RITUAL, and the WRITINGS OF THE PROPHETS. And a *Speaking action*, and an *Allegoric speech*, when thus employed, had all the secrecy that the occasion required. We have observed, that in the simpler use of speaking by *Action*, the Action itself hath no *moral import:* and so, the information having but one moral meaning, that which it conveys is clear and intelligible. But where a Rite of Religion is used for this *Speaking action*, there the action hath a *moral import;* and so the information having two moral meanings, that which it conveys is more obscure and mysterious. Hence it appears that this mode of *speaking by action*, called a TYPE, is exactly fitted for the information in question. Just so it is again with the SECONDARY SENSE: In the *mere allegory*, the representing image has no moral import: in the *secondary sense*, for a contrary reason (which the very term imports), the representing image hath a moral import; and so, acquires the same *fitting obscurity* with information by *Types*. For the *typical Ritual*, and the *double Prophecy*, had each its obvious sense in the present nature and future fortune of the Jewish Religion and Republic. And here we are easily led into the essential difference (so much to the honour of

* *Homilia prima*, "De Prophetarum Obscuritate."

Revelation) between the Pagan Oracles or Prophecies, and the Jewish. The obscurity of the Pagan arose from the *ambiguity, equivocation or jargon* OF EXPRESSION; the obscurity of the Jewish from *the figurative representation* OF THINGS. The First (independent of any other Religion) proceeded from ignorance of futurity; the Latter, dependent on the Christian, proceeded from the necessity that those to whom the Prophecies were delivered should not have too full a knowledge of them.

Dr. Middleton, indeed, would fain persuade us, that the *Oracles*, or, as he chuses to call them, the *Prophecies* of the Pythian Apollo, were neither better nor worse, but exactly of the same absurd construction with the *Scripture Prophecies*. He would hardly venture to controvert what I have said of their logical fitness and propriety, as a mode of information in the abstract, because this would shew him ignorant of the nature and progress of human converse. Much less, I suppose, would he say, that this mode of information was not suited to the genius of the Jewish Religion; since he owns *that* to be only a preparatory System calculated to open and to prepare the way for one more perfect; and consequently, that it must be so contrived as to *connect*, and at the same to *hide* from the vulgar eye, the two parts of the Dispensation, and the relation they have to one another. Now there is no conceivable way of doing this but by *types* and *secondary senses*. What then occasioned this insult upon them? That which supports all our free Writers in their contemptuous treatment of Religion, their mistaking the ABUSE of the thing for the thing ITSELF; and giving the interpretations of men, or the Doctrines of Churches, for Articles of faith or Scripture history. What hath been here said will shew the extreme weakness of this ingenious man's parallel between the Scripture Prophecies and the Oracles of the Pythian Apollo.—"The PROPHECIES of the Pythian Apollo" (says he) "were indeed obscure, equivocal and ambiguous, admitting not only different but contrary senses; so that the character here given of the Scripture Prophecies was undoubtedly true of them, *that no event could restrain them to one determinate sense, when they were originally capable of many*. For if the obvious sense failed, as it often did, to the ruin of those who acted upon it, there was another always in reserve, to secure the veracity of the Oracle: till this very character of its ambiguous and ænigmatical senses, confirmed by constant observation, gradually sunk its credit, and finally detected the imposture."* *The prophecies of the Pythian Apollo were obscure, equivocal and ambiguous. And this* (says he) *was the character of the Scripture Prophecies.* Just otherwise, as is seen above. Scripture Prophecies were *obscure;* but the obscurity arose

* "Examination of the Bishop of London's Discourses on Prophecy," &c. pp. 89, 90.

neither from *equivocation* nor *ambiguity* (which two qualities proceed from the EXPRESSION) but from *the figurative representation of* THINGS. So that the *obscurity*, which the Pythian Oracle and the Scripture Prophecies had in common, arising from the most different grounds, the character given of the Oracles, *That no event could restrain them to one determinate sense when they were originally capable of many*, by no means belongs to the Scripture Prophecies, whatever the men he writes against (who appear to know as little of the DOUBLE SENSE of Prophecies as himself) might imagine. For though *equivocal and ambiguous* EXPRESSION may make a speech or writing, where the objects are unconfined, capable of *many senses*, yet a *figurative representation of* THINGS can give no more senses than *two* to the obscurest Prophecy. Hence it will follow, that while the expedient in supporting the Pythian Oracles, by having a sense always in reserve to satisfy the inquirer, *would gradually sink their credit, and finally detect the imposture;* the discovery of a SECONDARY SENSE of Prophecy, relative to the completory Dispensation, will necessarily tend to confirm and establish the divine origin of Scripture Prophecy.

Such was the wonderful œconomy of divine Wisdom, in connecting together two dependent Religions, the parts of one grand Dispensation: by this means, making one preparatory of the other; and each mutually to reflect light upon the other. Hence we see the desperate humour of that learned man, though very zealous christian,* who, because most of the prophecies relating to JESUS, in the Old Testament, are of the nature described above, took it into his head that the Bible was corrupted by the enemies of JESUS. Whereas, on the very supposition of a mediate and an ultimate Religion, which this good man held, the main body of Prophecies in the Old Testament relating to the New must, according to all our ideas of fitness and expediency, needs be prophecies with a DOUBLE SENSE. But it is the usual support of folly to throw its distresses upon knavery. And thus, as we observed, the Mahometan likewise, who pretends to claim under the Jewish religion, not finding the doctrine of a *future state of rewards and punishments* in the Law, is as positive that the Jews have corrupted their own scriptures in pure spite to his great Prophet.†

III. Having thus shewn the reasonable use and great expediency of these modes of sacred information, under the Jewish Œconomy; the next question is, Whether they be indeed there. This we shall endeavour to shew.—And that none of the common prejudices may lie against our reasoning, the example given shall be of TYPES and DOUBLE

* MR. WHISTON. † See note LLL, at the end of this book.

SENSES employed even in subjects relating to the *Jewish dispensation only*.

1. The whole ordinance of the *passover* was a TYPE of the *redemption from Egypt*. The striking the blood on the side-posts, the eating flesh with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, and in a posture of departure and expedition, were all significative of their bondage and deliverance. This will admit of no doubt, because the Institutor himself has thus explained the *Type*.—*And thou shalt shew thy son*, (says he) *in that day, saying, This is done because of that which the Lord did unto me, when I came forth out of* Egypt. *And it shall be a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes; that the Lord's law may be in thy mouth. For with a strong hand hath the Lord brought thee out of* Egypt. *Thou shalt therefore keep this ordinance in his season from year to year.** As therefore it was of the genius of these holy Rites to be *Typical* or significative of God's past, present, and future dispensations to his people, we cannot in the least doubt, but that *Moses*, had he not been restrained by those important considerations explained above, would have told them that the *sacrifice of the lamb without blemish* was a *Type*, a sign or memorial of THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

2. With regard to DOUBLE SENSES, take this instance from Joel: who, in his prediction of an approaching ravage by *Locusts*, foretels likewise, in the same words, a succeeding desolation by the *Assyrian army*. For we are to observe that this was GOD'S method both in warning and in punishing a sinful people. Thus, when the *seven nations* for their exceeding wickedness were to be exterminated, GOD promises his chosen people to *send hornets before them, which should drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite from before them*.† Now Joel, under one and the same Prophecy, contained in the first and second Chapters of his book, foretels, as we say, both these plagues; the *locusts* in the *primary* sense, and the *Assyrian army* in the *secondary*—"Awake, ye drunkards, and weep and howl, all ye drinkers of wine, because of the new wine, for it is cut off from your

* Exod. xiii. 8, et seq. † Exod. xxiii. 23. This, the author of the book called the "Wisdom of Solomon" admirably paraphrases:—"For it was thy will to destroy by the hands of our fathers both those old inhabitants of thy holy land, whom thou hatedst for doing most odious works of witchcrafts, and wicked sacrifices; and also those merciless murderers of children, and devourers of man's flesh, and the feasts of blood, with their priests out of the midst of their idolatrous crew, and the parents that killed, with their own hands, souls destitute of help: That the land which thou esteemedst above all other might receive a worthy colony of GOD'S children. Nevertheless even *those* thou sparedst as men, *and didst send wasps, forerunners of thine host*, to destroy them by little and little. Not that thou wast unable to bring the ungodly under the hand of the righteous in battle, or to destroy them at once with *cruel beasts*, or with one rough word: But executing thy judgments upon them by little and little, thou gavest them place of repentance, not being ignorant that they were a naughty generation, and that their malice was bred in them, and that their cogitation would never be changed." Chap. xii. 3, et seq.

mouth. For a nation is come up upon my land, strong and without number; whose teeth are the teeth of a lion, and he hath the cheek-teeth of a great lion. He hath laid my vine waste, and barked my fig-tree; he hath made it clean bare, and cast it away, the branches thereof are made white—The field is wasted, the land mourneth; for the corn is wasted: The new wine is dried up, the oil languisheth. Be ye ashamed, O ye husbandmen: Howl, O ye vine-dressers, for the wheat and for the barley; because the harvest of the field is perished.*—Blow ye the trumpet in *Zion*, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain. Let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand. A day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains: a great people and a strong, there hath not been ever the like—A fire devoureth before them, and behind them a flame burneth: The land is as the garden of *Eden* before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness, yea, and nothing shall escape them. The appearance of them is as the appearance of horses, and as horsemen so shall they run. Like the noise of chariots on the tops of mountains shall they leap, like the noise of a flame of fire that devoureth the stubble, as a strong people set in battle array. Before their face the people shall be much pained: all faces shall gather blackness. They shall run like mighty men, they shall climb the wall like men of war, and they shall march every one on his ways, and they shall not break their ranks; neither shall one thrust another, they shall walk every one in his path: and when they fall upon the sword, they shall not be wounded. They shall run to and fro in the city: they shall run upon the wall, they shall climb up upon the houses: they shall enter in at the windows like a thief. The earth shall quake before them, the heavens shall tremble, the sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining."†

The fine conversion of the subjects is remarkable. The prophecy is delivered in the first chapter,—*Awake, ye drunkards,* &c. and repeated in the second—*Blow ye the trumpet in Zion,* &c. In the first chapter, the LOCUSTS are described as a *people;—For a nation is come up upon my land, strong and without number.* But, that we may not be mistaken in the PRIMARY sense, namely the plague of locusts, the ravages described are the ravages of insects: *They lay waste the vine, they bark the fig-tree, make the branches clean bare, and wither the corn and fruit-trees.* In the second chapter, the hostile PEOPLE are described as *locusts:*—AS THE MORNING SPREAD UPON THE MOUNTAINS. *The appearance of them is* AS *the appearance of horses, and* AS *horsemen so shall they run,* AS *a strong people*

* Joel i. 5, et seq. † Joel ii. 1—11.

set in battle array. They shall run LIKE *mighty men, they shall climb the wall* LIKE *men of war.* But that we may not mistake the SECONDARY sense, namely the invasion of a foreign enemy, they are compared, we see, to a mighty army. This art, in the contexture of the Prophecy, is truly divine; and renders all chicane to evade a *double sense* ineffectual. For in some places of this Prophecy, *dearth by insects* must needs be understood; in others, *desolation by war.* So that both senses are of necessity to be admitted. And here let me observe, that had the Commentators on this Prophecy but attended to the nature of the *double sense*, they would not have suffered themselves to be so embarrassed; nor have spent so much time in freeing the Prophet from an imaginary embarras (though at the expence of the context) on account of the same Prophecy's having in one part that signification *primary*, which, in another, is *secondary*. A circumstance so far from making an inaccuracy, that it gives the highest elegance to the discourse; and joins the *two* senses so closely as to obviate all pretence for a division, to the injury of the Holy Spirit. Here then we have a DOUBLE SENSE, not arising from the interpretation of a single verse, and so obnoxious to mistake, but of a whole and very large descriptive Prophecy.

But as this species of *double prophecy*, when confined to the events of one single Dispensation, takes off the most plausible objection to *primary* and *secondary* senses in general, it may not be improper to give another instance of it, which shall be taken from a Time when one would least expect to find a *double prophecy* employed, I mean, under the Gospel-Dispensation. I have observed, somewhere or other, that the ŒCONOMY OF GRACE having little or nothing to hide or to shadow out, like the LAW, it had small occasion for *typical* Rites or Celebrations, or for Prophecies with a *double sense;* and that therefore they are not to be expected, nor indeed are they to be found, under the Gospel.

Yet the example I am about to give is an illustrious exception to this general truth. The explanation of this example will rectify a great deal of embarras and mistake concerning it, and, at the same time, support the general Truth. The Prophecy I mean, is that in which Jesus foretels his FIRST and SECOND COMING IN JUDGMENT, not only under the same ideas, but in one and the same Prediction, as it is recorded, in nearly the same terms, by Matthew, Mark, and Luke; though omitted by St. John, for the reason hereafter to be given.

But to comprehend the full import of this Prophecy, it will be proper to consider the occasion of it. Jesus, after having warmly upbraided the Scribes and Pharisees whom he found in the Temple, with their superstitious abuses of the Law; with their aversion to be

reformed;—and their obstinate rejection of their promised Messiah; left them with a dreadful denunciation of the ruin* then hanging over their Civil and Religious Policy. His Disciples who followed him through the Temple, greatly affected with these threats, and yet possessed with the national prejudice of the Eternity of the Law, pointed, as he passed along, at the Temple Buildings, and desired him to observe the stupendous solidity and magnificence of the Work. As much as to say, "Here are no marks of that speedy destruction which you have just now predicted: on the contrary, this mighty Mass seems calculated to endure till the general dissolution of all things." To which, Jesus, understanding their thoughts, replied, that in a very little time *there should not be left one stone upon another*, of all the wonders they saw before them. And from thence takes occasion to prophesy of the speedy destruction of the Jewish Nation. But as the bare prediction of the ruin of that splendid Œconomy would be likely to scandalize these carnal-minded men, while they saw nothing erected in its stead, by their Messiah and Deliverer, it seemed good to divine Wisdom to represent this destruction under the image of their Messiah's coming to execute judgment on the devoted City, and of his raising a new Œconomy on its ruin; as was done by the establishment of the Christian Policy.†

But yet, as this was to be unattended with the circumstances of exterior grandeur, He relieves the picture of the *Church-militant*, erected on his coming TO JUDGE JERUSALEM, with all the splendours of the *Church triumphant*, which were to be displayed at his second coming TO JUDGE THE WORLD. And this, which was so proper for the ornament, and useful for the dignity of the Scene, was necessary for the completion of the Subject, which was a full and entire view of the *Dispensation of Grace*. Thus, as JOEL in one and the same description had combined the previous ravages of the Locusts with the succeeding devastations of the Assyrians, so here, JESUS hath embroidered into one Piece the intermediate judgment of the Jews, and the final Judgment of mankind.‡

Let us now see what there was in the *notions* and *language* of the Jewish People, that facilitated the easy introduction of the *secondary sense;* and gave the style, which was proper to that sense, an expressive elegance when applied to the *primary*.

The Jews, besotted with their fancied Eternity of the Law, had entertained a notion that the destruction of Jerusalem was to be immediately followed with the destruction of the World. This made the closeness in the connexion between the *primary* and *secondary*

* Matt. xxiii.; Mark xiii. 34; Luke xxi. 25.

† See "Julian, or a Discourse concerning his Attempt to rebuild the Temple." Luke xxi.

‡ Matt. xxiv.; Mark xiii.;

sense of the descriptive prophecy, easy and natural; and as it made the two destructions scarce dividual, so it left no room to distinguish, in any formal manner, between the *first* and *second* coming in Judgment.

The old *prophetic language* was of equal use and advantage to interweave the two senses into one another, which the *notion* here mentioned had drawn together and combined. The change of Magistracy, the fall of Kingdoms, and the revolutions of States, are described, in the old language of inspiration, by disasters in the Heavens, by the fall of Stars, and by eclipses of the greater Luminaries. This admirably served the purpose of conveying both events under the same set of images; indeed, under one and the same description; namely, the destruction of Jerusalem in the FIGURATIVE sense; and the destruction of the world in the LITERAL.—*The sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light: and the stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken. And they shall see the Son of man coming in the Clouds with great power and glory.**

So that we see, the representation of a *double sense* in this Prophecy hath all the ease, and strength, and art, which we can conceive possible to enter into a sacred information of this nature. And the close contexture of its parts is so far from obscuring any thing in the two great correlative pictures, portrayed upon it, that it serves to render each more distinct, and better defined. Different indeed in this from most of the Jewish Prophecies of the same kind: And the reason of the difference is obvious. In the Jewish Prophecies, the *secondary sense*, relating to matters in another Dispensation, was of necessity to be left obscure, as unsuitable to the knowledge of the time in which the Prophecy was delivered. Whereas the *first* and *secondary* senses of the Prophecy before us, were equally objective to the contemplation of Christ's Disciples; as the two capital parts of the Dispensation to which they were now become subject.

But it will be said, "That before all this pains had been taken to explain the *beauties* of the double sense, we should have proved the *existence* of it; since, according to our own account of the matter, the magnificent terms employed, which are the principal mark of a SECONDARY sense, are the common prophetic Language to express the subject of the PRIMARY: And because, when Jesus, in few words, repeats the substance of this Prophecy to the High-Priest, on the like occasion for which he delivered it at large to his Disciples, he describes the destruction of Jerusalem in those high terms from whence the SECONDARY sense is inferred: for when Jesus was accused of threatening, or of designing to destroy the Temple, and was urged by

* Mark xiii. 24—26; Matt. xxiv. 29, 30.

the High-Priest to make his defence, he says—*Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven;** which words the context necessarily confines to his *first coming* in judgment on Jerusalem."

To this I answer, That it was not for fear of being put to the proof that it was taken for granted, that this Prophecy had a *double sense*, a primary and a secondary; because it is only quoting a passage or two in it, to shew that it must necessarily be confessed to have both.

1. That Jesus prophesies of the destruction of Jerusalem, appears from the concluding words recorded by all the three Evangelists—*Verily, I say unto you, that* THIS GENERATION *shall not pass away till* ALL *these things be done or fulfilled.*† Hence, by the way, let me observe, that this fulfilling in the *primary* sense being termed the *fulfilling all*, seems to be the reason why St. John, who wrote his Gospel after the destruction of Jerusalem, hath omitted to record this Prophecy of his Master.

2. That Jesus at the same time speaks of the destruction of the World, at his coming to judge it, appears likewise from his own words recorded by the same Evangelists—*But of that day and hour knoweth no man; no not the Angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.*‡ For if the Whole be to be understood only of one single event, then do these two texts expressly contradict one another; the first telling us that the event should come to pass near the close of that very generation; the latter telling us that the time is unknown to all men, nay even to the Angels and to the Son himself:—then does the last quoted text expressly contradict the Prophecy of Daniel,§ that very Prophecy to which Jesus all the way refers; for in that prophecy, the *day and hour*, that is, the precise time of the destruction of Jerusalem, is minutely foretold.

Hence it follows that this famous Prophecy hath indeed a DOUBLE SENSE, the one *primary*, and the other, *secondary*.

It is true, the infant-Church saw the destruction of the world so plainly foretold in this Prophecy as to suffer an error to creep into it, of the speedy and instant consummation of all things. This, St. Paul found necessary to correct—*Now I beseech you*, says he, *that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or troubled, as that the day of Christ is at hand*, &c.‖ And it was on this account, I suppose, that St. Luke, who wrote the latest of the three Evangelists, records this Prophecy in much lower terms than the other two, and entirely omits the words in the text quoted above, which fixes the *secondary* sense of the Prophecy—*of that day and hour*, &c.

* Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62; Luke xxii. 69. † Matt. xxiv. 34; Mark xiii. 30; Luke xxi. 32. ‡ Mark xiii. 32. § Dan. viii. 13, 14. ‖ 2 Thess. ii. 1, *et seq.*

If St. Paul exhorted his followers not to be *shaken in mind* on this account; his fellow-labourer, St. Peter, when he had in like manner reproved the *scoffers*, who said, *where is the promise of his coming?* went still further, and, to shew his followers that the Church was to be of long continuance here on earth, explains to them the nature of that evidence which *future times* were to have of the truth of the Gospel; an evidence even superior to that which the primitive times enjoyed of MIRACLES;* *We have also a more sure word of* PROPHECY; *whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light which shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts.*† This evidence of PROPHECY is justly qualified *a more sure word*,‡ when compared to MIRACLES, whose demonstrative evidence is confined to that age in which the power of them was bestowed upon the Church: whereas the *prophecies* here meant, namely, those of St. Paul and St. John,§ concerning the GREAT APOSTACY, were always fulfilling even to the last consummation of all things; and so, affording this demonstrative evidence to the men of all generations.

However, if from this prophecy the first Christians drew a wrong conclusion, it was not by the fault of the Divine Prophet, but their own. Jewish Tradition might at first mislead the followers of Jesus to believe that the destruction of the World was very soon to follow the destruction of Jerusalem: But these men soon put off Tradition, with the Law: And Scripture, which was then recommended to them as their only study, with the DOUBLE SENSES with which it abounds, might easily have led them to a *distinction of times* in this Prophecy, a Prophecy formed, as they must needs see, upon the ancient models.

But as Providence is always educing good out of evil (though neither for this, nor any other reason, is evil ever connived at by the disciples of Christ, as appears from the conduct of St. Paul, just mentioned above) this error was fruitful of much service to truth. It nourished and increased a spirit of piety, seriousness, and charity, which wonderfully contributed to the speedy propagation of the Gospel.

Before I conclude, let me just observe (what I have always principally in view) that this explanation of the Prophecy obviates all those impious and absurd insinuations of licentious men, as if Jesus was led either by craft or enthusiasm, either by the gloominess of his own ideas, or by his knowledge of the advantage of inspiring such into his Followers, to prophesy of the speedy destruction of the World.

—But by strange ill fortune even some *Believers*, as we have

* 2 Peter i. 17. † Verse 19. ‡ Βεβαιότερον, more firm, constant, and durable. § See SIR ISAAC NEWTON on the Prophecies, chap. i. of his "Observations upon the Apocalypse of St. John."

observed, are come at length to deny the very existence of *double senses* and *secondary prophecies*. A late writer hath employed some pages to proclaim his utter disbelief of all such fancies. I shall take the liberty to examine this bold rectifier of prejudices: not for any thing he hath opposed to the Principles here laid down; for I dare say these were never in his thoughts; but only to shew that all he hath written is wide of the purpose: though, to say the truth, no wider than the notions of those whom he opposes; men who contend for Types and Secondary senses in as extravagant a way as he argues against them; that is, such who take a handle from the Doctrine of *double senses* to give a loose to the extravagances of a vague imagination: consequently his arguments, which are aimed against their very being and *use*, hold only against their *abuse*. And that *abuse*, which others indeed have urged as a proof against the *use*, he sets himself to confute: * a mighty undertaking! and then mistakes his reasoning for a confutation of the *use*.

His Argument against *double senses* in Prophecies, as far as I understand it, may be divided into two parts, 1. Replies to the reasoning of others for *double senses*. 2. His own reasoning against them. With his Replies I have nothing to do (except where something of argument against the *reality* of double senses is contained) because they are replies to no reasonings of mine, nor to any that I approve. I have only therefore to consider what he hath to say against the thing itself.

1. His first argument against more senses than one, is as follows —"Supposing that the opinion or judgment of the Prophet or Apostle is not to be considered in matters of *Prophecy* more than the judgment of a mere *amanuensis* is,—and that the point is not what the opinion of the *amanuensis* was, but what the *inditer* intended to express; yet it must be granted, that if God had any views to some remoter events, at the same time that the words which were used were equally applicable to, and designed to express, *nearer* events: those *remoter* events, as well as the *nearer*, were in the intention of GOD: And if both the nearer and remoter events were equally intended by God in any Proposition, then the LITERAL SENSE OF THEM IS NOT THE ONE NOR THE OTHER SINGLY AND APART, BUT BOTH TOGETHER must be the full meaning of such passages." †

—*Then the literal sense of them is not the one nor the other singly and apart, but both of them together*, &c. i. e. if both together make up but *one literal sense*, then there is neither a *secondary* nor a *double sense*: And so there is an end of the controversy. A formidable Adversary truly! He threatens to *overthrow the thing*, and gives us

* "The Principles and Connection of Natural and Revealed Religion, distinctly considered," p. 221, by Dr. Sykes. † Page 219.

an argument against the *propriety of the name*. Let him but allow his adversaries that a *nearer* and a *remoter* event are both the subjects of one and the same Prediction, and, I suppose, it will be indifferent to them whether he call it, with them, a *Prophecy of a double and figurative sense*, or they call it, with him, a *Prophecy of a single literal sense*: And he may be thankful for so much complaisance; for it is plain, they have the better of him even in the *propriety of the name*. It is confessed that GOD, in these predictions, might have views to *nearer* and *remoter* events: now these nearer and remoter events were events under two different Dispensations, the Jewish and the Christian. The Prediction is addressed to the Jews, who had not only a more immediate concern with the first, but, at the time of giving the Prophecy, were not to be let into the secrets of the other: Hence the Prediction of the *nearer* event was properly the *literal* or *primary* sense, as given for the present information of GOD's Servants; and the more *remote* event for their future information, and so was as properly the *secondary* sense, called with great propriety *figurative*, because conveyed under the *terms* which predicted the *nearer* event. But I hope a *first* and a *second*, a *literal* and a *figurative*, may both together at least make up a DOUBLE SENSE. SELDEN understood this matter better, when he said, "The Scripture may have more senses besides the *literal*, because GOD understands all things at once; but a man's writing has but one true sense, which is that which the author meant when he writ it." *

2. His second argument runs thus,—"WORDS are the signs of our thoughts, and therefore stand for the ideas in the mind of him that uses them. If then words are made use of to signify *two or more things at the same time*, their significancy is really lost, and it is impossible to understand the real certain intention of him that uses them. Were GOD therefore to discover any thing to mankind by any written Revelation, and were he to make use of such TERMS as stand for ideas in mens minds, he must speak to them so as to be understood by them. They must have in their minds the ideas which God intended to excite in them, or else it would be in vain to attempt to make discoveries of his Will; and the TERMS made use of must be such as were wont to raise such certain ideas, or else there could be no written Revelation. The true sense therefore of ANY PASSAGE of Scripture can be but ONE; or if it be said to contain more senses than one, if such multiplicity be not revealed, the Revelation becomes useless, because unintelligible." †

Men may talk what they please of the obscurity of Writers who have *two senses*, but it has been my fortune to meet with it much oftner in those who have *none*. Our Reasoner has here mistaken the

* "Table-Talk." † Pages 222, 223.

very Question, which is, whether a Scripture PROPOSITION (for all Prophecies are reducible to Propositions) be capable of two senses; and, to support the negative, he labours to prove that WORDS OR TERMS can have but one.—*If then* WORDS *are made use of to signify two or more* THINGS *at the same time, their significancy is really lost —such* TERMS *as stand for ideas in mens minds—*TERMS *made use of must be such as are wont to raise such certain ideas*—All this is readily allowed; but how wide of the purpose, may be seen by this instance: Jacob says, *I will go down into* Sheol *unto my son mourning.* Now if SHEOL signify in the ancient *Hebrew* only the *Grave*, it would be abusing the TERM to make it signify likewise, with the vulgar *Latin, in infernum*, because if WORDS (as he says) *be made to signify two or more things at the same time, their significancy is lost.* —But when this PROPOSITION of the Psalmist comes to be interpreted, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hell* [SHEOL] *neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption;* though it literally signifies security from the curse of the Law upon transgressors, *viz.* immature death, yet it is very reasonable to understand it in a spiritual sense, of the resurrection of CHRIST from the dead; in which, the *words* or *terms* translated *Soul* and *Hell*, are left in the meaning they bear in the Hebrew tongue, of *Body* and *Grave.*

But let us suppose our Reasoner to mean that a PROPOSITION is not capable of *two senses*, as perhaps he did in his confusion of ideas, for notwithstanding his express words to the contrary, before he comes to the end of his argument, he talks of *the true sense of* ANY PASSAGE *being but one;* and then his assertion must be, *That if one Proposition have two Senses, its significancy is really lost; and that it is impossible to understand the real certain intention of him that uses them; consequently Revelation will become useless, because unintelligible.*

Now this I will take the liberty to deny. In the following instances a *single Proposition* was intended by the writers and speakers to have a *double sense.* The poet Virgil says,

> —"Talia, per clypeum Volcani, dona parentis
> Miratur: rerumque ignarus, imagine gaudet,
> ATTOLLENS HUMERO FAMAMQUE ET FATA NEPOTUM."*

The last line has these *two senses:* First, that Æneas bore on his shoulders a shield, on which was engraved a prophetic picture of the fame and fortunes of his posterity: Secondly, that under the protection of that piece of armour he established their fame and fortunes, and was enabled to make a settlement in Latium, which proved the foundation of the Roman empire.†

Here then is a *double sense*, which, I believe, none who have any

* *Æneid.* lib. viii. in fin. † See note MMM, at the end of this book.

taste of Virgil will deny. The preceding verse introduces it with great art,

"*Miratur*, rerumque *ignarus* imagine gaudet:"

and prepares us for something mysterious, and hid behind the *letter*.

On Peter's refusing to eat of clean and unclean meats promiscuously, in the vision presented to him, the Holy Spirit says, *What God hath cleansed that call not thou common*.* The single proposition is, *That which God hath cleansed is not common or impure;* but no one who reads this story can doubt of its having this double sense: 1. *That the distinction between clean and unclean meats was to be abolished.* 2. And *That the Gentiles were to be called into the church of* CHRIST. Here then the true sense of these PASSAGES is not *one*, but *two:* and yet the intention or meaning is not, on this account, the least obscured or lost, or rendered doubtful or unintelligible.

He will say, perhaps, "that the very nature of the subject, in both cases, determines the two senses here explained." And does he think, we will not say the same of *double senses in the Prophecies?* But he seems to take it for granted, that Judaism and Christianity have no kind of relation to one another: Why else would he bring, in discredit of a *double sense*, these two verses of Virgil:

"Hi motus animorum, atque hæc certamina tanta
Pulveris exigui jactu composta quiescunt."

On which he thus descants—*The words are determinate and clear.—Suppose now a man having occasion to speak of intermitting fevers and the ruffle of a man's spirits, and the easy cure of the disorder by pulverized bark, &c.*†—To make this pertinent, we must suppose no more relation between the fortunes of the Jewish Church and the Christian, than between a *battle of Bees*, and the *tumult of* the *animal Spirits:* if this were not his meaning, it will be hard to know what was, unless to shew his happy talent at a parody.

But as he seems to delight in classical authorities, I will give him one not quite so absurd; where he himself shall confess that a *double meaning* does in fact run through one of the finest Odes of Antiquity. Horace thus addresses a crazy ship in which his friends had embarked for the Ægean sea:

"O navis, referent in mare te novi
Fluctus! ô quid agis? fortiter occupa
Portum: nonne vides ut
Nudum remigio latus, &c.‡

In the first and *primary* sense, he describes the dangers of his friends in a weak unmanned vessel, and in a tempestuous sea: in the *secondary*, the dangers of the Republic in entering into a new civil

* Acts x. 15. † Page 225. ‡ HORATII *Od.* lib. i. od. 14.

war, after all the losses and disasters of the old. As to the *secondary sense*, which is ever the most questionable and obscure, we have the testimony of early Antiquity delivered by Quintilian: As to the *primary sense*, the following will not suffer us to doubt of it:

> "Nuper solicitum quæ mihi tædium,
> Nunc desiderium, curaque non levis,
> Interfusa nitentes
> Vites æquora Cycladas."

But there being, as we have shewn above, two kinds of allegories; (the first, *viz.* the *proper* allegory; which hath but *one real sense*, because the literal meaning, serving only for the *envelope*, and without a *moral import*,* is not to be reckoned; the second, the *improper*, which hath *two*, because the literal meaning is of *moral import*; and of this nature are Prophecies with a *double sense*) the Critics on Horace, not apprehending the different natures of these two kinds, have engaged in very warm contests. The one side seeing some parts of the Ode to have a necessary relation with a real ship, contend for its being *purely historical*; at the head of these is Tanaquil Faber, who first started this criticism, after fifteen centuries of peaceable possession of the Allegory: the other side, on the authority of Quintilian, who gives the ode as an example of this figure, will have it to be *purely allegorical*. Whereas it is evidently both one and the other; of the nature of the *second kind* of allegories, which have a *double sense*; and this double sense, which does not in the least obscure the meaning, the learned reader may see, adds infinite beauty to the whole turn of the Apostrophe. Had it been *purely historical*, nothing had been more cold or trifling; had it been *purely allegorical*, nothing less natural or gracious, on account of the enormous length into which it is drawn.—Ezekiel has an allegory of that sort which Quintilian supposes this to be, (namely, a *proper allegory with only one real sense*) and he manages it with that brevity and expedition which a *proper allegory* demands, when used in the place of a metaphor. Speaking of Tyre under the image of a Ship, he says, *Thy Rowers have brought thee into great waters: the east-wind hath broken thee in the midst of the Seas.*† But suppose the Ode to be both *historical* and *allegorical*, and that, under his immediate concern for his Friends, he conveyed his more distant apprehensions for the Republic; and then there appears so much ease, and art, and dignity in every period, as makes us justly esteem it the most finished composition of Antiquity.

What is it then which makes the *double sense* so ridiculous and absurd in, *Hi motus animorum, &c.* and so noble and rational in, *O Navis referent, &c.* but this, That, in the latter case, the subject of the *two senses* had a close connexion in the INTERESTS OF THE

* See above, p. 168, et seq. † Ezek. xxvii. 26.

WRITER; in the former, none at all? Now that which makes two senses *reasonable*, does, at the same time, always make them *intelligible* and obvious. But if this be true, then a double sense in Prophecies must be both reasonable and intelligible: For I think no Believer will deny that there was the closest connexion between the Jewish and Christian systems, in the Dispensations of the Holy Spirit.—This will shew us, with what knowledge of his subject the late Lord Bolingbroke was endowed, when he endeavoured to discredit *Types* and *Figures* by this wise observation, "That Scripture Types and Figures have NO MORE RELATION TO the things said to be typified, than to any thing that passes now in France."*

3. His next argument runs thus—"If GOD is disposed to reveal to mankind any truths—he must convey them in such a manner that they may be understood—if he speaks to men, he must condescend to their infirmities and capacities—Now if he were to contrive a Proposition in such a manner—that the same Proposition should relate to *several* events; the consequence would be, that as often as events happened which agreed to any Proposition, so often would the Revelation be accomplished. But this would only serve to increase the confusion of men's minds, and never to clear up any Prophecy: No man could say what was intended by the spirit of GOD: And if MANY events were intended, it would be the same thing as if NO event was intended at all."†

I all along suspected he was talking against what he did not understand. He proposed to prove the absurdity of a *double* or *secondary sense*‡ of Prophecies; and now he tells us of MANY senses; and endeavours to shew how this would make Prophecy useless. But sure he should have known, what the very phrase itself intimates, that no prophetic Proposition is pretended to have more than TWO senses: And farther, that the subject of each is supposed to relate to *two* connected and successive Dispensations: which is so far from creating *any confusion in men's minds*, or *making a Prophecy useless*, that it cannot but strengthen and confirm our belief of, and give *double* evidence to, the divinity of the Prediction. On the contrary, he appears to think that what orthodox Divines mean by a *second sense*, is the same with what the Scotch Prophets mean by a *second sight*; the seeing one thing after another as long as the imagination will hold out.

4. His last Argument is—"Nor is it any ground for such a supposition, that the Prophets being FULL OF THE IDEAS of the *Messiah*, and his glorious kingdom, MADE USE OF IMAGES taken from thence, to express the points upon which they had occasion to speak. From *whencesoever* they took their ideas, yet when they spoke of *present*

* "Works," vol. iii. p. 306. † Page 226. ‡ See p. 221.

facts, it was *present facts* only that were to be understood. Common language, and the figures of it, and the manner of expression; the *metaphors*, the *hyperboles*, and all the usual forms of speech, are to be considered: And if the occasions of the expression are taken from a *future state*, yet still the Proposition is to be interpreted of that *one* thing to which it is particularly applied."*

Orthodox Divines have supported the reasonableness and probability of *double senses* by this material Observation, that the inspired Writers were *full of the ideas of the Christian Dispensation*. That is, there being a close relation between the Christian and the Jewish, of which the Christian was the completion, whenever the Prophets spoke of any of the remarkable fortunes of the one, they interwove with it those of the other. A truth, which no man could be so hardy to deny, who believes, 1. That there is that relation between the two Religions: and 2. That these inspired men were let into the nature and future fortunes of both. See now in what manner our Author represents this observation. *It is no ground*, says he, *for a double sense, that the Prophets were full of the ideas of a Messiah and his glorious kingdom, and made use of images taken from thence;* [that is, that they enobled their style by their habitual contemplation of magnificent ideas.] *For* (continues he) *whencesoever they took their ideas, when they spoke of present facts, present facts alone were to be understood. Common language and the figures of it, &c.*—Without doubt, from such a *fulness of ideas*, as only raised and enobled their style, it could be no more concluded that they meant future facts, when they speak of present, than that Virgil, because he was full of the magnificent ideas of the Roman grandeur, where he says, *Priami Imperium—Divûm Domus, Ilium, et Ingens gloria Teucrorum*, meant *Rome* as well as *Troy*. But what is all this to the purpose? Orthodox Divines talk of a *fulness of ideas* arising from the Holy Spirit's revealing the *mutual dependency* and *future fortunes* of the two Dispensations; and revealing them for the information, solace, and support of the Christian Church: And Dr. Sykes talks of a *fulness of ideas* got nobody knows how, and used nobody knows why,—*to raise* (I think he says) *their style and enoble their images*. Let him give some good account of this representation, and then we may be able to determine, if it be worth the trouble, whether he here put the change upon himself or his readers. To all this Dr. Sykes replies, "It was no answer, to shew that there are *allegories and allegorical interpretations*, for these were never by me denied." Exam. p. 363. Why does he tell us of his never denying *allegories*, when he is called upon for denying *secondary senses?* Does he take these things to be *different?* If he does, his answer is nothing to the purpose, for he is only

* Page 227.

charged, in express words, with denying *secondary senses*. Does he take them to be the *same?* He must then allow *secondary senses;* and so give up the question; that is, retract the passages here quoted from him. He is reduced to this dilemma, either to acknowledge that he first writ, or that he now answers, to no purpose.*

From hence, to the end of the chapter, he goes on to examine particular texts urged against his opinion; with which I have at present nothing to do: first, because the proper subject of this section is the *general nature* only of types and double senses: and secondly, because what room I have to spare, on this head, is for a much welcomer Guest, whom I am now returning to, the original author of these profound reasonings, Mr. COLLINS himself.

II.

We have shewn that *types* and *secondary senses* are rational, logical, and scholastic modes of information: that they were expedient and highly useful under the Jewish Œconomy: and that they are indeed to be found in the Institutes of the Law and the Prophets. But now it will be objected, "that, as far as relates to the Jewish Œconomy, a *double sense* may be allowed; because the future affairs of that Dispensation may be well supposed to occupy the thoughts of the Prophet; but it is unreasonable to make one of the senses relate to a different and remote Dispensation, never surely in his thoughts. *For the books of the Old Testament* (Mr. Collins tells us) *seem the most plain of all ancient writings, and wherein there appears not the least trace of a Typical or Allegorical intention in the Authors, or in any other Jews of their time.*"†

I reply, that was it even as our adversaries suggest, that *all* the Prophecies, which, we say, relate to JESUS, relate to him only in a *secondary* sense; and that there were no other intimations of the New Dispensation but what such Prophecies convey; it would not follow that *such* sense was false or groundless. And this I have clearly shewn in the account of their nature, original, and use. Thus much I confess, that without miracles, in confirmation of such sense, some‡ of them would with difficulty be proved to have it; because we have shewn, that a commodious and designed obscurity attends both their nature and their use. But then, This let me add, and these Pretenders to superior reason would do well to consider it, that the authority of divine Wisdom as rationally forces the assent to a *determined meaning* of an obscure and doubtful Proposition, as any other kind of logical evidence whatsoever.

But this which is here put, is by no means the case. For we say,

* See note NNN, at the end of this book.

† "Grounds and Reasons," &c. p. 82.

‡ See note OOO, at the end of this book.

1. That some of the Prophecies relate to JESUS in a *primary* sense. 2. That besides these, there are in the prophetic Writings, the most clear and certain intimations of the *Gospel Œconomy*, which are alone sufficient to ascertain the reality of the *secondary*.

I. That SOME Prophecies relate to the MESSIAH in a *primary sense*, hath been invincibly proved by many learned men before me: I shall mention therefore but ONE; and that, only because Mr. Collins hath made some remarks upon it, which will afford occasion for a farther illustration of the subject. JESUS declares, of John the Baptist—*This is the* ELIAS *that was for to come.* "Wherein" (says the Author of *the Grounds*, &c.) "he is supposed to refer to these words of Malachi, *Behold I will send you Elijah the Prophet before the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord;* which, according to their LITERAL sense, are a Prophecy that *Elijah* or *Elias* was to come in person, and therefore not LITERALLY but MYSTICALLY fulfilled in *John the Baptist.*" * And again, *in his Scheme of literal Prophecy considered*, speaking of this passage of *Malachi*, he says, "But to cut off all pretence for a *literal* Prophecy, I observe, first, That the literal interpretation of this place is, that *Elias*, the real *Elias*, was to come. And is it not a MOST PLEASANT literal interpretation to make *Elias* not signify *Elias*, but somebody who resembled him in qualities?—Secondly I observe, that the *Septuagint* Translators render it, *Elias the Tishbite*,—and that the *Jews*, since CHRIST's time, have generally understood, from the passage before us, that *Elias is to come in person.*—But *John Baptist* himself, who must be supposed to know who he was himself, when the question was asked him, *whether he was Elias*, denied himself to be *Elias;* and when asked who he was, said, he was the voice of one crying in the Wilderness, *&c.* which is a passage taken from *Isaiah.*" †

1. The first thing observable in these curious remarks is, that this great Advocate of Infidelity did not so much as understand the terms of the question. The words, says he, *according to their literal sense, are a Prophecy that Elijah was to come in person, and therefore not literally but mystically fulfilled in* John *the* Baptist. He did not so much as know the meaning of a *primary* and *secondary sense*, about which he makes all this stir. A *secondary* sense indeed implies a *figurative* interpretation; a *primary* implies a *literal:* But yet this *primary* SENSE does not exclude *figurative* TERMS. The *primary* or literal sense of the Prophecy in question is, that, before the great and terrible day of the Lord, a messenger should be sent, resembling in character the Prophet *Elijah;* this messenger, by a *figure*, is called the Prophet *Elijah*. A figure too of the most easy and natural import; and of especial use amongst the Hebrews, who were accus-

* "Grounds and Reasons," &c. pp. 47, 48. † Page 127.

tomed to denote any character or action by that of the kind which was become most known or celebrated. Thus the Prophet Isaiah: "And the Lord shall utterly destroy the *tongue* of the *Egyptian* sea, and with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over the river, and shall smite it in the *seven streams*." * Here, a second passage through the *Red Sea* is promised in *literal terms:* But who therefore will say that this is the *literal meaning?* The literal meaning, though the prophecy be in *figurative terms*, is simply redemption from bondage. For EGYPT, in the Hebrew phrase, signified *a place of bondage*. So again Jeremiah says; "A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping: RACHEL weeping for her children refused to be comforted because they were not." † The primary sense of these words, according to Grotius, is a prediction of the weeping of the Jewish matrons for their children carried captive to Babylon by Nabuzaradan. Will he say therefore that this Prophecy was not *literally* fulfilled, because *Rachel* was dead many ages before, and did not, that we read of, return to life on this occasion? Does not he see that, by the most common and easy figure, the Matrons of the tribe of Benjamin were called by the name of this their great Parent? As the Israelites, in Scripture, are called *Jacob*, and the posterity of the son of Jesse by the name of *David:* So again, Isaiah says, "Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of SODOM; give ear unto the Law of our GOD, ye people of GOMORRAH." ‡ Will he say, the people of *Sodom* and *Gomorrah* are here addressed to in the *primary* sense, and the people of the Jews only in the *secondary?* But the preceding words, which shew the people of *Sodom* and *Gomorrah* could not now be addressed to, because there were none left, shew likewise that it is the Jewish Nation which is called by these names. *Except the Lord of Hosts had left us a very* small remnant, *we should have been as* Sodom, *and we should have been like unto* Gomorrah.§ Would not he be thought an admirable interpreter of *Virgil* who should criticise the Roman Poet in the same manner?—*Virgil seems the most plain of all ancient writings: And he says,*

"Jam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna."

Which, according to its literal meaning, is, that the Virgin *returns, and old* Saturn *reigns again, in person; therefore not* LITERALLY, *but* MYSTICALLY *fulfilled in the justice and felicity of* Augustus's *reign. And it is a* MOST PLEASANT *literal interpretation, to make the* Virgin *and* Saturn *not signify the* Virgin *and* Saturn, *but somebody who resembled them in qualities.* Such reasoning on a Classic, would be called *nonsense* in every language. But Freethinking sanctifies all sorts of impertinence. Let me observe further, that this was a kind

* Isai. xi. 15. † Jer. xxxi. 15. ‡ Isai. i. 10. § Verse 9.

of compound blunder: LITERAL, in common speech, being opposed both to *figurative* and to *spiritual;* and MYSTICAL signifying both *figurative* and *spiritual;* he fairly confounded the distinct and different meanings both of LITERAL and of MYSTICAL.

He goes on—*I observe, that the Septuagint Translators render it* Elias *the* Tishbite—*and that the* Jews *since* CHRIST'S *time have generally understood from this passage, that* Elias *is to come in person. And* John Baptist *himself, who must be supposed to know who he was himself, when the question was asked him, denied himself to be* Elias.—Why does he say, *Since* CHRIST'S *time,* and not *before,* when it appears to be before as well as since, from his own account of the translation of the Septuagint? For a good reason. We should then have seen why *John the Baptist,* when asked, denied himself to be *Elias;* which it was not Mr. Collins's design we should see; if indeed we do not ascribe too much to his knowledge in this matter. The case stood thus: At the time of the Septuagint translation, and from thence to the time of CHRIST, the doctrine of a *Transmigration,* and of a *Resurrection of the body, to repossess the Land of Judea,* were national opinions; which occasioned the Jews by degrees to understand all these sorts of *figurative* expressions *literally.* Hence, amongst their many visions, this was one, that Elias should come again in person. Which shews what it was the Jews asked John the Baptist; and what it was he answered, when *he denied himself to be Elias:* Not that he was not the Messenger prophesied of by Malachi (for his pretending to be that Messenger evidently occasioned the question) but that he was not, nor did the prophecy imply that the Messenger should be, *Elias in person.*

But to set his reasoning in the fullest light, Let us consider a similar prophecy of Amos: *Behold the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a* FAMINE *in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst of water, but of hearing the words of the Lord.** I would ask, is this a Prophecy of *a famine of the word* in a *literal,* or in a *mystical* sense? Without doubt the Deist will own (if ever he expects we should appeal again to his ingenuity) in a *literal.* But now strike out the explanation [*not a famine of bread, nor a thirst of water*] and what is it then? Is it not still a *famine of the word* in a *literal* sense? *Mystical,* if you will, in the meaning of *metaphorically obscure,* but not in the meaning of *spiritual.* But *mystical* in this latter signification only, is opposed to *literal,* in the question about *secondary senses.* It appears then, that *a want of preaching the word* is still the *literal* meaning of the Prophecy, whether the explanation be in or out, though the *figurative* term [*famine*] be used to express that meaning. And the reason why the Prophet explains the term,

* Amos viii. 11.

was not, because it was a harsh or unnatural *figure*, to denote *want of preaching*, any more than the term *Elijah* to denote a similar character, which Malachi does not explain; but because the Prophecy of Amos might have been for ever mistaken, and the *figurative* term understood *literally*; the People being at that time, often punished for their sins by a *famine of bread*.

But this abusive cavil at *figurative terms* will remind us of his observations on the following Prophecy of Isaiah—"Even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called an house of Prayer FOR ALL PEOPLE." * This, he says, must needs relate to Jewish, not to Christian times. Why? Because *sacrifices* are mentioned. But how could this truth be told the Jewish People, *that all nations should be gathered to the true* GOD, otherwise than by using terms taken from Rites familiar to them; unless the nature of the Christian Dispensation had been previously explained? A matter evidently unfit for their information, when they were yet to live so long under the Jewish. For though the Prophets speak of the little value of, and small regard due to, the *ceremonial* Law; they always mean (and always make their meaning understood) when the *ceremonial Law* is superstitiously observed, and observed to a neglect of the *moral*; which last they describe in the purity and perfection of the Gospel. So admirable was this conduct! that while it hid the future Dispensation, it prepared men for it.

Thus then stands the argument of this mighty Reasoner. There are *no* Prophecies, he says, which relate to JESUS but in a *secondary sense*. Now a secondary sense is *unscholastic* and *enthusiastical*. To this we answer, that the Prophecy of Malachi about Elijah, and of Isaiah about bringing all people to his holy mountain, relate to JESUS in a *primary sense*. He replies, No, but in a *mystical, only*. Here he begins to quibble, the sure sign of an expiring Argument: *Mystical* signifies as well *secondary* as *figurative*. In the sense of *secondary*, the interpretation of these Prophecies to JESUS is *not mystical*; in the sense of *figurative* it is. But is the use of a *figurative term* enthusiastical or unscholastic, when the end is only to convey information concerning a less known thing in the *terms* of one more known? Now whether we are to charge this to ill faith or a worse understanding, his Followers shall determine for me.

2. But we will suppose all that an ingenuous Adversary can ask—"That most of the Prophecies in question relate to JESUS in a *secondary sense only*; the rest in a *primary*, but expressed in *figurative* terms; which, till their completion, threw a shade over their

* Isai. lvi. 7.

meaning, and kept them in a certain degree of obscurity." Now, to shew how all this came about, will add still farther light to this very perplexed question.

We have seen, from the nature and long duration of the Jewish Œconomy, that the Prophecies which relate to JESUS, must needs be darkly and enigmatically delivered: We have seen how the *allegoric* Mode of speech, then much in use, furnished the means, by what we call a *double sense* in Prophecies, of doing this with all the requisite obscurity. But as some of these Prophecies by their proper light alone, without the confirmation of miracles, could hardly have their sublimer sense so well ascertained; to render all opposers of the Gospel without excuse, it pleased the Holy Spirit, under the last race of the Prophets, to give credentials to the mission of JESUS by predictions of him in a *primary* and *literal* sense. Yet the Jewish œconomy being to continue long, there still remained the same necessity of a covert and mysterious conveyance. That figurative expression therefore, which was before employed in the *proposition*, was now used in the *terms*. Hence, the Prophecies of a *single sense* come to be in highly figurative words: as before, the earlier Prophecies of a *double sense* (which had a *primary* meaning in the affairs of the Jewish State, and, for the present information of that People) were delivered in a much simpler phrase.

The Jewish Doctors, whose obstinate adherence, not to the *letter of the Law*, as this Writer ignorantly or fraudulently suggests, but to the mystical interpretations of the *Cabala*, prevents their seeing the true cause of this difference in the LANGUAGE, between the earlier and later Prophets; the Jewish Doctors, I say, are extremely perplexed to give a tolerable account of this matter. What they best agree in is, that the *figurative enigmatic style* of the later Prophets (which however they make infinitely more obscure by cabalistic meanings, than it really is, in order to evade the relation which the Predictions have to JESUS) is owing to the *declining state* of prophecy. *Every Prophet*, says the famous Rabbi, Joseph Albo, *that is of a strong, sagacious, and piercing understanding, will apprehend the thing nakedly without any similitude; whence it comes to pass that all his sayings are distinct and clear, and free from all obscurity, having a literal truth in them: But a Prophet of an inferior rank or degree, his words are obscure, enwrapped in riddles and parables; and therefore have not a literal but allegorical truth contained in them.** And indeed our fictitious Rabbi seems to have had as little knowledge of this matter as the other; for in answer to what Mr. Whiston, who, extravagant as he was in rejecting all *double senses*, yet knew the difference between a *secondary* and *enigmatic* prophecy, which, we

* SMITH'S "Select Discourses," p. 180.

shall see, Mr. Collins did not, in answer, I say, to Mr. Whiston, who observed *that the Prophecies* [meaning the *primary*] *which relate to Christianity are covered, mystical and enigmatical,* replies, *This is exactly equal mysticism with, and just as remote from the real literal sense as the mysticism of the Allegorists* [*i. e.* the Contenders for a double sense] *and is altogether as* OBSCURE *to the understanding.** His argument against *secondary senses* is, that they are *unscholastic* and *enthusiastical.* Mr. Whiston, to humour him, presents him with *direct* and *primary* Prophecies, but tells him, at the same time, they are expressed in *covered, mystical, and enigmatic terms.* This will not satisfy him; *it is no better than the mysticism of the Allegorists.* How so? We may think perhaps, that he would pretend to prove, because his argument requires he should prove, that *enigmatical expressions* are as *unscholastic* and *enthusiastical* as *secondary senses.* No such matter. All he says is, that they are *as* OBSCURE *to the understanding.* But *obscurity* is not his quarrel with *secondary senses.* He objects to them as *unscholastic and enthusiastical.* But here lay the difficulty; no man, who pretended to any language, could affirm this, of *figurative enigmatical expressions;* he was forced therefore to have recourse to his usual refuge, OBSCURITY.

It is true, he says, these *mystical enigmatic Prophecies (as Mr. Whiston calls them) are equally remote from the real literal sense, as the mysticism of the Allegorists.* But this is only a repetition of the blunder exposed above, where he could not distinguish between the literal sense of a *Term,* and the literal sense of a *Proposition.* And how gross that ignorance is we may see by the following instance. Isaiah says, *The Wolf also shall dwell with the Lamb, and the Leopard shall lie down with the Kid; and the Calf, and the young Lion, and the Fatling together, and a little Child shall lead them.*† Now I will take it for granted that his Followers understand this, as Grotius does, of the profound peace which was to follow after the times of Senacherib, under Hezekiah; but though the *terms* be *mystical,* yet sure they call this the *literal sense* of the prophecy: For Grotius makes the *mystical sense* to refer to the Gospel. Mr. Whiston, I suppose, denies that this has any thing to do with the times of Hezekiah, but that it refers to that of CHRIST only. Is not his interpretation therefore *literal* as well as that of Grotius? unless it immediately becomes *odly typical, unscholastic, and enthusiastical,* as soon as ever JESUS comes into the question.

II. But now, besides the *literal primary* prophecies concerning the PERSON of JESUS, we say, in the second place, that there are other, which give a *primary* and *direct* intimation of the CHANGE OF THE DISPENSATION. Isaiah foretels great mercies to the Jewish People,

* "The Grounds and Reasons," &c. p. 242. † Isai. xi. 6.

in a future Age; which, though represented by such metaphors as bore analogy to the blessings peculiar to the Jewish Œconomy, yet, to shew that they were indeed different from what the *figurative terms* alluded to, the Prophet at the same time adds, *My thoughts are not as your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord.** This surely implies a *different* DISPENSATION. That the change was from *carnal* to *spiritual*, is elegantly intimated in the subjoining words,—*For as the* HEAVENS *are higher than the* EARTH, *so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.*† But this higher and more excellent Dispensation is more plainly revealed in the following figure: *Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir-tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle-tree;* ‡ *i. e.* the *new* Religion shall as far excel the *old*, as the fir-tree does the thorn, or the myrtle the brier. In a following Prophecy he shews the EXTENT of this new Religion as here he had shewn its NATURE; that it was to spread beyond Judea, and to take in the whole race of mankind,—*The* GENTILES *shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising, &c.*§ Which idea the Prophet Zephaniah expresses in so strong a manner, as to leave no room for evasion: *The Lord will be terrible unto them, for he will* FAMISH *all the* GODS OF THE EARTH; *and men shall worship him every one* FROM HIS PLACE, *even all the isles of the* GENTILES.‖ The expression is noble, and alludes to the popular superstitions of Paganism, which conceived that their Gods were nourished by the steam of sacrifices. But when were the Pagan Gods thus *famished*, but in the first ages of Christianity?—*Every one from his place;* that is, they were not to go up to JERUSALEM to worship.—*Even all the isles of the Gentiles:* but when did these worship the God of Israel *every one from his place*, before the preaching of the Apostles? Then indeed their speedy and general conversion distinguished them from the rest of the nations. This he expresses yet more plainly in another place. "In that day shall there be an *altar* to the Lord in the midst of the Land of *Egypt;*" ¶ *i. e.* the Temple-service shall be abolished; and the God of Israel worshiped with the most solemn rites, even in the most abhorred and unsanctified places, such as the Jews esteemed Egypt. Which Malachi thus diversifies in the expression, *And in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a* PURE OFFERING;** *i. e.* it shall not be the less acceptable for not being at the *Temple.*

But Isaiah, as he proceeds, is still more explicite, and declares, in direct terms, that the Dispensation should be changed, *Behold I create* NEW HEAVENS *and a* NEW EARTH; *and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind.*†† This, in the prophetic style, means

* Isai. lv. 8. † Verse 9. ‡ Verse 13. § Isai. lx. 3. ‖ Zeph. ii. 11.
¶ Isai. xix. 19. ** See note PPP, at the end of this book. †† Isai. lxv. 17.

a NEW RELIGION and a NEW LAW; the metaphors, as we have shewn elsewhere, being taken from hieroglyphical expression. He speaks in another place, of the consequence of this *change;* namely, the transferring the benefits of Religion from the Jewish to the Christian Dispensation. "Is it not yet a very little while, and Lebanon [*the isles of the Gentiles*] shall be turned into a fruitful field, and the fruitful field [*the land of Judea*] shall be esteemed as a forest?" * To make it yet more clear, I observe farther, that the Prophet goes on to declare the *change* of the SANCTION; and this was a necessary consequence of the change of the Dispensation.—*There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: For the child shall die an hundred years old, but the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed;* † *i. e.* the SANCTION OF TEMPORAL REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS shall be no longer administered in an extraordinary manner; for we must remember, that long life for obedience, and sudden and untimely death for transgressions, bore an eminent part in the Sanction of the Jewish Law. Now these are expressly said to be abrogated in the Dispensation promised, it being declared that the Virtuous, though dying immaturely, should be as if they had lived an hundred years; and Sinners, though living to an hundred years, as if they had died immaturely.

The very same prophecy in Jeremiah, delivered in less figurative terms, supports this interpretation beyond all possibility of cavil: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a NEW COVENANT with the house of *Israel*, and with the house of *Judah, not according to the Covenant that I made with their fathers*, in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of *Egypt*.—But *this shall be the Covenant* that I will make with the house of *Israel*, After those days, saith the Lord, *I will put my Law in their* INWARD PARTS, *and write it in their* HEARTS." ‡—

What Isaiah figuratively names a *new Heaven and a new Earth*, Jeremiah simply and literally calls a *new Covenant*. And what kind of Covenant? Not such an one as was made with their Fathers. This was declarative enough of its nature; yet, to prevent mistakes, he gives as well a *positive* as a *negative* description of it: *This shall be the Covenant, I will put my Law in their inward parts, &c. i. e.* this Law shall be *spiritual*, as the other given to their Fathers was *carnal:* For the Ceremonial Law did not scrutinize the heart, but rested in external obedience and observances.

Lastly, to crown the whole, we may observe, that Jeremiah too, like Isaiah, fixes the true nature of the Dispensation by declaring the CHANGE of the SANCTION: "In those days they shall say no more, the fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the childrens teeth are set on

* Isai. xxix. 17. † Isai. lxv. 20. ‡ Jer. xxxi. 31—33.

edge. But every one shall die for his own iniquity; every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge." * For it was part of the Sanction of the Jewish Law, that children should bear the iniquity of their fathers, *&c.* a mode of punishing which hath been already explained and justified. Yet all these Prophecies of the GOSPEL being delivered in terms appropriate to the LAW, the Jews of that time would naturally, as they in fact did, understand them as speaking of the extension and completion of the OLD Dispensation, rather than the perfection of it by the introduction of a NEW. And thus their reverence for the present System, under which they were yet to continue, was preserved. The necessity of this proceeding, for the present time;—the effects it would afterwards produce through the perversity of the superstitious followers of the Law;—and the divine goodness as well as wisdom manifested in this proceeding, are all finely touched in the following passage of Isaiah †—"Whom shall he teach knowledge? and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? Them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts.‡ For precept must be [or *hath been*] upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line,§ here a little and there a little. For with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this People.‖ To whom he said, This is the rest, and this is the refreshing,¶ yet they would not hear. But the word of the Lord was unto them, precept upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line, here a little and there a little; that they might go and fall backward, and be broken and snared and taken."**

Notwithstanding all this, if you will believe our Adversary, *The books of the Old Testament seem the most* PLAIN *of all ancient writings, and wherein there appears* NOT THE LEAST TRACE OF TYPICAL OR ALLEGORICAL INTENTION *in the Authors, or in any other* Jews *of their times.*†† He that answers a Free-thinker will find employment enough.—*Not the least trace of a typical or allegorical intention!* He might as well have said there is *not the least trace* of poetry in Virgil, or of eloquence in Cicero. But there is none, he says, *either in the Authors, or in any other* Jews *of their times.* Of both which Assertions, this single Text of Ezekiel will be an abundant confutation.—*Ah Lord,* THEY SAY OF ME, DOTH HE NOT SPEAK PARABLES? ‡‡ The Prophet complains that his ineffectual Mission proceeded from his speaking, and from the People's conceiving him to

* Jer. xxxi. 29, 30. † Isai. xxviii. 9, et seq. ‡ That is, Those who were most free from the prejudices of the *Eternity* of the Law. § This reduplication of the phrase was to add force and energy to the sense. ‖ That is, Gospel truths delivered in the language of the Law. ¶ That is, The glad tidings of the Gospel. ** That is, This gradual yet repeated instruction, which was given with so much mercy and indulgence, to lead them by slow and gentle steps from the Law to the Gospel, being abused so as to defeat the end, God in punishment made it the occasion of blinding their eyes and hardening their hearts. †† "Grounds and Reasons," &c. p. 82. ‡‡ Ezek. xx. 49.

speak, of things mysteriously, and in a mode of delivery not understood by them. The Author of the book of Ecclesiasticus, who is reasonably supposed to have been contemporary with Antiochus Epiphanes, represents holy Scripture as fully fraught with typical and allegoric wisdom: "He that giveth his mind to the Law of the Most High, and is occupied in the meditation thereof, will seek out the wisdom of the Ancients, AND BE OCCUPIED IN PROPHECIES. He will keep the sayings of the renowned men; and where SUBTILE PARABLES are, he will be there also. He will seek out the SECRETS OF GRAVE SENTENCES, and be conversant in DARK PARABLES."* Hence it appears that the Jewish Prophecies were not so *plain* as our Adversary represents them; and that their obscurity arose from their having *Typical* or *Allegorical intentions:* which figures too related not to the *present*, but to a *future* Dispensation, as is farther seen from what Ezekiel says in another place—*Son of man, behold they of the house of Israel say*, THE VISION THAT HE SEETH IS FOR MANY DAYS TO COME, AND HE PROPHESIETH OF THE TIMES THAT ARE FAR OFF.† So that these People to whom the Prophecies were so *plain*, and who understood them to respect their own times only, *without any Typical or Allegoric meaning*, complain of *obscurities* in them, and consider them as referring to very *remote times*. But I am ashamed of being longer serious with so idle a Caviller. The *English Bible* lies open to every FREE-THINKER of Great Britain; Where they may read it that will, and understand it that can.

As for such Writers as the Author of the *Grounds and Reasons*, To say the truth, one would never wish to see them otherwise employed: But when so great and so good a man as GROTIUS hath unwarily contributed to support the dotages of Infidelity, this is such a misadventure as one cannot but lament.

This excellent Person (for it is not to be disguised) hath made it his constant endeavour throughout his whole Comment on the Prophets, to find a *double* sense even in those *direct* Prophecies which relate to JESUS; and to turn the *primary* sense upon the affairs of the Jewish Dispensation; only permitting them to relate to JESUS in a *secondary:* and by that affected strain of interpretation, hath done almost as much harm to Revelation as his other writings have done it service: not from any strength there is in his Criticisms (for this, and his Comment on the Apocalypse, are the opprobrium of his great learning), but only from the name they carry with them.

The Principle which *Grotius* went upon, in commenting the Bible, was, that it should be interpreted on the same rules of Criticism that men use in the study of all other ancient Writings. Nothing could

* Ἐν προφητείαις ἀσχοληθήσεται—ἐν στροφαῖς παραβολῶν συνεισελεύσεται—ἐν αἰνίγμασι παραβολῶν ἀναστραφήσεται.—Chap. xxxix. 1—3. † Ezek. xii. 27.

be more reasonable than his Principle: but unluckily he deceived himself in the *application* of it. These rules teach us that the GENIUS, PURPOSE, and AUTHORITY of the Writer should be carefully studied. Under the head of his *authority* it is to be considered, whether he be a mere *human* or an *inspired* Writer. Thus far Grotius went right: he examined that authority; and pronounced the Writers to be *inspired*, and the Prophecies *divine*: But when he came to apply these premisses, he utterly forgot his conclusion; and interpreted the Prophecies by rules very different from what the confession of their divine original required: for seeing them pronounced by Jewish Prophets, occupied in Jewish Affairs, he concluded their sole Object was Jewish; and consequently that the proper sense of the Prophecies referred to these only. But this was falling back from one of the grounds he went upon, That the Writers were *inspired*: for his interpretation was only reasonable on the supposition that these Writers prophesied in the very manner which the Pagans understood their Prophets sometimes to have done, by a *natural sagacity*: For, on the allowance of a real inspiration, it was GOD, and not the Writer, who was the proper Author of the Prophecy; and to understand *his purpose*, which the rules of interpretation require us to seek, we must examine the nature, reason, and end of that Religion which he gave to the Jews: For on *these*, common sense assures us, the meaning of the Prophecies must be intirely regulated. Now if, on enquiry, it should be found, that this which Grotius admitted for a divine Dispensation, was only preparatory of another more perfect, it would then appear not to be improbable that some of these Prophecies might relate, in their *literal*, *primary*, and *immediate* sense, to that more perfect Dispensation. And whether they did so or not was to be determined by the joint evidence of the context, and of the nature of GOD's whole Dispensation to mankind, so far forth as it is discoverable to us. But Grotius, instead of making the matter thus reasonably problematical, and to be determined by evidence, determined first, and laid it down as a kind of Principle, that the Prophecies related directly and properly to Jewish affairs: and into this system he withdrew all his explanations. This, as we say, was falsely applying a true rule of interpretation. He went on this reasonable ground, that the Prophecies should be interpreted like all other ancient Writings: and, on examining their *authority*, he found them to be truly *divine*. When he had gone thus far, he then preposterously went back again, and commented as if they were confessed to be merely *human*: The consequence was, that several of his criticisms, to speak of them only as the performance of a man of learning, are so forced, unnatural, and absurd, so opposed to the rational canon of interpretation, that I will venture to affirm they are, in all

respects, the worst that ever came from the hand of an acute and able Critic.

III.

Having now proved that the Principles which Mr. Collins went upon are in themselves false and extravagant, one has little reason to regard how he employed them. But as this extraordinary Writer was as great a Free-thinker in Logic as in Divinity, it may not be improper to shew the fashionable World what sort of man they have chosen for their Guide, to lead them from their Religion, when they would no longer bear with any to direct them in it.

His argument against what he calls *typical, allegorical,* but properly, *secondary* senses, stands thus:—"Christianity pretends to derive itself from Judaism. JESUS appeals to the religious books of the Jews as prophesying of his Mission. None of these Prophecies can be understood of him but in a *typical allegoric* sense. Now that sense is absurd, and contrary to all scholastic rules of interpretation. Christianity, therefore, not being really predicted of in the Jewish Writings, is consequently false."—The contestable Proposition, on which the whole argument rests, is, *That a typical or allegoric sense is absurd, and contrary to all scholastic rules of interpretation.*

Would the Reader now believe that Mr. Collins has himself, in this very book, given a thorough confutation of his own capital Proposition? Yet so it is; and, contrary too to his usual way of reasoning, he has done it in a very clear and convincing manner; by shewing, that the *typical* and *allegorical* way of writing was universally practised by Antiquity.—"Allegory" (says he) "was much in use amongst the *Pagans,* being cultivated by many of the Philosophers themselves as well as Theologers. By SOME AS THE METHOD OF DELIVERING DOCTRINES; but by most as the method of explaining away what, according to the letter, appeared absurd in the ancient fables or histories of their Gods. Religion itself was deemed a mysterious thing amongst the *Pagans,* and not to be publicly and plainly declared. Wherefore it was never simply represented to the People, but was most obscurely delivered, and vail'd under Allegories, or Parables, or Hieroglyphics; and especially amongst the Egyptians, Chaldeans, and the Oriental Nations.—They allegorized many things of nature, and particularly the heavenly bodies—They allegorized all their ancient fables and stories, and pretended to discover in them the secrets of Natural Philosophy, Medicine, Politicks, and in a word all Arts and Sciences. The works of *Homer* in particular have furnished infinite materials for all sorts of allegorical Commentators to work upon.—The ancient Greek Poets were reputed to involve divine, and natural, and historical notions of their Gods under mystical and parabolical expressions—The *Pythagorean* Philosophy was wholly delivered

in mystical language, the signification whereof was entirely unknown to the world abroad—The *Stoic* Philosophers are particularly famous for allegorizing the whole heathen Theology—We have several treatises of heathen Philosophers on the subject of allegorical interpretation."*

If now this kind of *allegorizing*, which involved the Proposition in a *double sense*, was in use amongst the Pagan Oracles, Divines, Philosophers and Poets, is not the understanding ancient writings *allegorically*, or in a *double sense*, agreeable to all rational, scholastic rules of interpretation? Surely, as much so as the understanding mere *metaphorical* expressions in a *tropical* signification; whose propriety no one ever yet called in question. For the sense of *Propositions* is imposed as arbitrarily as the sense of *words*. And if men, in the communication of their thoughts, agree to give, on some occasions, a *double* sense to *Propositions*, as well as on others, a *single*, the interpreting the first in *two* meanings is as agreeable to all scholastic rules, as interpreting the other in *one*: And *Propositions*, with a double and single sense, are as easily distinguishable from each other, by the help of the context, as *Words* with a literal and figurative meaning. But this great Philosopher seems to have imagined, that the *single sense of a Proposition* was imposed by Nature; and that therefore, giving them a *double meaning* was the same offence against Reason as the deviating from the unity of pure *Theism* into *Polytheism*: and, consequently, that the universal lapse into ALLEGORY and IDOLATRY rendered neither the one nor other of them the less absurd.†

I say, he seems to think so. More one cannot say of such a Writer. Besides, he seems to think otherwise, where, in another place, as if aware that *Use* would rescue a *double sense* from his *irrational* and *unscholastic* censure, he endeavours to prove, that the Jews, during the prophetic period, did not use this allegoric way of expression. Now if we be right in this last conjecture about his meaning, he abuses the terms he employs, under a miserable quibble; and, by *scholastic* and *unscholastic rules*, only means interpreting in a *single* or a *double sense*.

The Reader perhaps will be curious to know how it happened, that this great Reasoner should, all at once, overthrow what he had been so long labouring to build. This fatal issue of his two books of the GROUNDS, &c. and SCHEME, &c. had these causes:

1. He had a pressing and immediate *objection* to remove. And, as he had no great stock of argument, and but small forecast, any thing, at a plunge, would be received, which came to his relief.

The objection was this—"That the allegorical interpretations of the Apostles were not designed for absolute proofs of Christianity, but for arguments *ad homines* only to the Jews, who were accustomed to that

* "Grounds and Reasons," &c. pp. 83—86. † See note QQQ, at the end of this book.

way of reasoning."*—Thus, he himself tells us, some Divines are accustomed to talk. He gives them indeed a solid answer; but he dreams not of the consequence. He says, this *allegoric reasoning* was common to all mankind. Was it so? Then the grand Proposition on which his whole work supports itself is entirely overthrown. For if all mankind used it, the method must needs be *rational* and *scholastic*. But this he was not aware of. What kept him in the dark, was his never being able to distinguish between the USE and the ABUSE of this mode of information. These two things he perpetually confounds, *The Pagan Oracles delivered themselves in allegories;*—this was the use: *Their later Divines turned all their Religion into allegory;*—this was the abuse. *The elder* Pythagoreans *gave their Precepts in allegory*—this was the use: *The later* Stoics *allegorized every thing;*—this was the abuse. Homer *had some allegories;*—this was the use: *His Commentators turned all to allegory;*—and this again was the abuse. But though he has talked so much of these things, yet he knew no more of them than old JOHN BUNYAN; whose honester ignorance, joined to a good meaning, disposed him to *admire* that which the malignity of our Author's folly inclined him to *decry:* and each in the like ridiculous extreme.

2. But the other cause of this subversion of his own system was the delight he took to blacken the splendor of Religion. He supposed, we may be sure, it would prove an effectual discredit to Revelation, to have it seen, that there was this conformity between the Pagan and Jewish method of delivering Religion and Morality. His attempt hath been already exposed as it deserves.† But in this instance it labours under much additional folly. For the *different* reasons which induced the Propagators of Paganism, and the Author of Judaism, to employ the *same* method of information, are obvious to the meanest capacity, if advanced but so far in the knowledge of nature to know, that *different ends* are very commonly prosecuted by the *same means*. The Pagans allegorized in order to hide *the weakness and absurdities of their national Religions;* the Author of Judaism allegorized in order to prepare his followers *for the reception of a more perfect Dispensation*, founded on Judaism, which was preparatory of it; and, at the same time, to *prevent* their *premature rejection* of Judaism, under which they were still to be long exercised.

Thus we see how this formidable Enemy of our Faith has himself overturned his whole Argument by an unwary answer to an occasional objection. But this is but *one*, of a Work full of contradictions. I have no occasion to be particular, after removing his main Principles; yet, for the Reader's diversion, I shall give him a taste of them. In his 81st page, he says—*And there has been for a long time, and is at*

* Page 79. † See vol. ii. book iv. sect. 1, at the end.

this time as little use of allegory in those respects amongst them [the Jews] *as there seems to have been during the time the books of the Old Testament were written, which seem the most plain of all ancient Writings, and wherein there appears not the least trace of a typical or allegorical intention in the Authors, or in any other* Jews *of their times.* Yet it is but at the 85th page that we find him saying—*And in this* [*viz.* in delivering his Philosophy in mystical language] PYTHAGORAS *came up to* SOLOMON'S *character of wise men, who dealt in dark sayings, and acted not much unlike the most divine Teacher that ever was. Our Saviour spake with many parables,* &c. Now it seems, it was Solomon's character of *wise men* that they dealt in *dark sayings.* But these wise men were the Authors of the Jewish Scriptures. And yet he had but just before assured us, *That the books of the Old Testament seem the most plain of all ancient Writings, and wherein there appears not the least trace of a typical or allegorical intention in the Authors, or in any Jews of their times.*

Again, in his pages 85, 86, he says, "The Pythagorean Philosophy was wholly delivered in mystical language; the signification whereof was intirely unknown to the world abroad, and but gradually explained to those of the sect, as they grew into years, or were proper to be informed—The Stoic Philosophers were particularly famous for *allegorizing*—We have several treatises of heathen Philosophers on the subject of allegorical interpretation—And from Philosophers, Platonists, and Stoics, the famous Origen is said to have derived a great deal of his skill in allegorizing the books of the Old Testament." This he says, and yet at the 94th page he tells us,—"That the Apostles, and particularly St. Paul, wholly discarded all other methods of reasoning used by Philosophers, except the *allegorical:* and set that up as the true and ONLY reasoning proper to bring all men to the faith of CHRIST: and the Gentiles were to be WHOLLY beat out of the literal way of arguing, and to argue as *became Jews.* And the event of preaching the Gospel has been suited to matters considered in this view and light. For we know that the WISE did not receive the Gospel at first, and that they were the latest Converts: *Which* PLAINLY *arose from their using maxims of reasoning and disputing* WHOLLY *opposite to those of Christians.*" By these *wise,* can be meant none but the Pagan Philosophers: and these, according to our Author, were altogether given up to mystery and allegory. Yet St. Paul, and the rest of the Apostles, who, he says, were likewise given up to the same method, could make no converts among these *wise* men. Why? It would now methinks have suited his talents as well as temper, to have told us, it was *because two of a trade could not agree:* No, says this incomparable Logician, *it was because the Philosophers used maxims of reasoning and disputing wholly opposite to the Christians.*

What now but the name and authority of *Freethinking* could hinder such a Writer from becoming the contempt of all who know either how to make, or to understand an argument? These men profane the *light* they receive from *Revelation* in employing it to rob the treasures of the *Sanctuary*. But RELIGION arrests them in the *manner*, and pronounces one common doom upon the whole race.

> —"Ne IGNIS NOSTER facinori præluceat,
> Per quem colendos censuit Pietas Deos,
> VETO ESSE TALE LUMINIS COMMERCIUM." *

Hence the fate that attends them all, in the inseparable connexion between *impiety* and *blundering;* which always follow one another as the crime and the punishment.

If it be asked then, What it is that hath so strangely prejudiced our modern Reasoners against this ancient mode of information by TYPICAL and SECONDARY senses? I answer, the folly of Fanatics, who have abused it in support of the most abominable nonsense. But how unreasonable is this prejudice! Was there ever any thing rational or excellent amongst Men that hath not been thus abused? Is it any disparagement to the *method of Geometers*, that some conceited writers on Morality and Religion have of late taken it up, to give an air of weight and demonstration to the whimsies of pedantic importance? Is there no truth of nature, or reasonableness of art, in *Grammatical construction*, because cabalistic Dunces have in every age abused it to pervert all human meaning? We might as well say that the ancient Egyptians did not write in Hieroglyphics, because Kircher, who endeavoured to explain them, hath given us nothing but his own visions, as that the ancient Jews had not *types* and *secondary senses*, because modern Enthusiasts have allegorized their whole Story.

But I from these *abuses* would draw a very contrary conclusion. The rage of *allegorizing* in Religion hath infected all ages: Can there be a stronger proof that the original mode was founded in the common conceptions of mankind? The Pagans began the *abuse;* and the pestilent infection soon spread amongst the followers of true Religion.

1. The early propagators of PAGANISM, in order to hide the weakness of the national Religion, delivered many things in Types and Allegories. But a growing Superstition, accompanied with an equal advance in knowledge, made it at length impossible to screen the folly even of the less obnoxious parts from common observers. Their Successors therefore, to support its credit, went on where the others had left off; and allegorized all the traditional stories of their Gods into *natural*, *moral*, and *divine* Entities. This, notwithstanding the extravagance of the means, fully answered the end.

* PHÆDRUS, lib. iv. fab. 10.

2. The JEWS ingrafted on *their* predecessors, just as the Pagans had done on *theirs;* and with the same secular policy: For being possessed with a national prejudice, that their Religion was to endure for ever, and yet seeing in it the marks of a carnal, temporary, and preparatory Dispensation, they cunningly allegorized its Rites and Precepts into a *spiritual* meaning, which covered every thing that was a real deficiency in a Religion which they considered as perfect and perpetual. Both these sorts of Allegorists therefore had reason in their rage.

3. Afterwards came a set of CHRISTIAN Writers, brought out from amongst *Jews* and *Gentiles;* and these too would needs be in the fashion, and allegorize their Religion likewise; but with infinitely less judgment than the others; though alas! with equal success. In their hands, the *end* proved as hurtful to truth as the *means* were extravagant in nature. And how should it be otherwise in a Religion both *divine* and *perfect?* For in such an one, there was nothing either to HIDE or to SUPPLY. We have shewn that *types* and *secondary senses* were employed in the Jewish Religion for the *sake of the Christian,* of which the Jewish was the groundwork and preparation. When therefore the *Christian* was come, these modes of information must needs cease, there being no farther occasion, nor indeed room, for them. As clear as this is to the lowest understanding, yet would some primitive Doctors of the Church needs contend with Jewish Rabbins, and Pagan Philosophers, in all the rage of *allegorizing:* Deaf to the voice of Reason, which called aloud to tell them, that those very arguments, which proved that there were, and must needs be, *types* and *secondary* senses in the *Old Testament,* proved as plainly that there neither were, nor could be any, in the *New.* Thus, to the inexpressible damage of Christianity, they exposed a *reasonable Service,* and a *perfected Dispensation* (where nothing was taught but Truth, plain, simple, and open) to the laughter and contempt of Infidels: who, bewildered in the universal maze of this *allegoric* mode of information, were never able to know what it was in its original, nor how to distinguish between the *use* and the *abuse.*

To CONCLUDE, Let not the Reader think I have been all this while leading him out of the way, while I have engaged his attention to the *book of* JOB; to the *Case of* ABRAHAM; and to TYPES *and secondary senses* under the Jewish Dispensation. All these strictly belong to the Argument:

1. First, as they greatly contribute to shew the HARMONY *of Truth;* and how all the parts of the Jewish Dispensation support and illustrate one another.

2. Secondly, as they contribute to shew the UNIFORMITY of it; and how the Holy Spirit, quite throughout GOD's grand Œconomy,

from his first giving of the Law to the completion of it by the Gospel, observed the same unvaried method of the GRADUAL COMMUNICATION *of Truth.*

3. Thirdly, as they contribute to shew the FOLLY of those who contend that the Christian Doctrine of a Future State was revealed to the early Jews; since this opinion destroys all the reason of a *secondary sense* of Prophecies: and of how great importance the reality of *this sense* is to the truth of Christianity hath been largely explained: For how can it be known with certainty, from the Prophecies themselves, that they contain *double senses*, but from hence, that the *old* Law was preparatory to, and the rudiment of, the *new?* How shall this *relation* be certainly known, but from hence, that *no future state* of Rewards and Punishments is to be found in the Mosaic Dispensation?* So close a dependence have all these important Principles on one another.

RECAPITULATION.

AND now, if the length of the Demonstration have not tired out the Reader's patience, or, to speak more properly, if length of time have not worn out his attention to the Subject, it may be proper (the Argument being here concluded) to take a retrospective view of the whole, as it hath been enforced in this and the preceding Volume.† For the deep Professor, who hath digested his Theology into Sums and Systems, and the florid Preacher, who never suffered his thoughts to expatiate beyond the limits of a pulpit-essay, will be ready to tell me, that I had promised to DEMONSTRATE THE DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES; and that now I had written two large Volumes on that subject, "all that they could find in them were Discourses on the foundation of Morality—the origin of civil and religious Society—the Alliance between Church and State—the policy of Lawgivers—the Mysteries of the Priests—and the opinions of the *Greek* Philosophers —The Antiquity of Egypt—their Hieroglyphics—their Heroes—and their Brute-worship. That, indeed, at last I speak a little of the Jewish policy; but I soon break away from it, as from a subject I would avoid, and employ the remaining part of the Volume on the Sacrifice of Isaac—on the book of Job—and on primary and secondary Prophecies. But what (say they) is all this to *The Divine Legation of Moses?*

Dic, Posthume! de tribus Capellis."

To call the Topic I went upon a PARADOX, was said, without doubt, to my discredit; but not to see that I had proved it in form,

* See note FF, at the end of this book.

† Books i. ii. iii. and iv. v vi. originally appeared in two vols. 4to.

will, I am afraid, redound to their own. Yet I had already bespoke their best attention in the words of Cicero, who, I believe, often found himself in my situation: "Video hanc primam ingressionem meam non ex ORATORIS disputationibus ductam, sed è media Philosophia repetitam, et eam quidem cum antiquam tum subobscuram, aut REPREHENSIONIS aliquid, aut certe ADMIRATIONIS habituram. Nam aut mirabuntur QUID HÆC PERTINEANT AD EA QUÆ QUÆRIMUS: quibus satisfaciet res ipsa cognita, ut non sine causa ALTE repetita videatur: aut reprehendent, QUOD INUSITATAS VIAS INDAGEMUS, TRITAS RELINQUAMUS. Ego autem me sæpe *nova* videri dicere intelligo cum *pervetera* dicam, sed *inaudita* plerisque."*

But as this Apology hath not answered its purpose, and as the ARGUMENT is indeed drawn out to an uncommon length; raised upon a great variety of supports; and sought out from every quarter of antiquity, and sometimes out of corners the most remote and dark; it was the less to be admired if every *inattentive* Reader did not see their force and various purpose; or if every *attentive* Reader could not combine them into the body of a completed Syllogism; and still less if the envious and the prejudiced should concur to represent these Volumes as an indigested and inconnected heap of discourses, thrown out upon one another, to disburthen a common-place. For the satisfaction therefore of the more candid, who acknowledge the fairness of the attempt, who saw something of the progress of the argument, but misled by the notice of a remaining part, neglected to pursue the proof to the CONCLUSION here deduced, I shall endeavour to lay open, in one plain and simple view, the whole conduct of these mysterious Volumes.

Nor shall I neglect the other sort of Readers, though it be odds we part again as dissatisfied with one another as the Toyman of Bath and his Customer: Of whom the story goes, that a grave well-dressed man coming into the shop of this ingenious inventor, and reliever of the distresses of those who are too dull to know what they want, and too rich to be at ease with what they have, demanded to see some of his best reading-glasses; which when he had tried to no purpose, he returned. The Toyman, surprised at so strange a phenomenon, gravely asked him, whether ever he had learnt to read? to which the other as gravely replied, that if he had been so happy, he should have had no need of his assistance. Now, before I bring the distant parts of my Argument to converge, for the use of these dim-sighted Gentlemen, may I ask them, without offence, a similar question? They have ANSWERED; without asking; but not with the same ingenuity.

In reading the LAW and HISTORY of the JEWS, with all the atten-

* CICERO.

tion I could give to them, amongst the many circumstances peculiar to that amazing Dispensation (from several of which, as I conceive, the divinity of its original may be fairly proved) these two particulars most forcibly struck my observation, THE OMISSION OF THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE, and THE ADMINISTRATION OF AN EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE. As unaccountable as the first circumstance appeared when considered separately and alone, yet when set against the other, and their mutual relations examined and compared, the *omission* was not only well explained, but was found to be an invincible medium for the proof of the DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES: which, as Unbelievers had been long accustomed to decry from this very circumstance, I chose it preferably to any other. The Argument appeared to me in a supreme degree strong and simple, and not needing many words to inforce it, or, when inforced, to make it well understood.

RELIGION hath always been held necessary to the support of CIVIL SOCIETY, because human Laws alone are ineffectual to restrain men from evil, with a force sufficient to carry on the affairs of public regimen: and (under the common dispensation of Providence) a FUTURE STATE of rewards and punishments is confessed to be as necessary to the support of RELIGION, because nothing else can remove the objections to God's moral Government under a Providence so apparently unequal, whose phænomena are apt to disturb the serious professors of RELIGION with doubts and suspicions concerning it, as it is of the essence of religious profession to believe, *that God is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.*

Moses, who instituted a RELIGION and a REPUBLIC, and incorporated them into one another, stands single amongst ancient and modern Lawgivers, in teaching a RELIGION, without the *sanction*, or even so much as the *mention* of a FUTURE STATE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS. The same Moses, with a singularity as great, by uniting the Religion and civil Community of the Jews into one incorporated body, made God, by natural consequence, their supreme civil Magistrate, whereby the form of Government arising from thence became truly and essentially a THEOCRACY. But as the *Administration* of Government necessarily follows its *Form*, that before us could be no other than AN EXTRAORDINARY OR EQUAL PROVIDENCE. And such indeed not only the Jewish Lawgiver himself, but all the succeeding Rulers and Prophets of this Republic have invariably represented it to be. In the mean time, no Lawgiver or founder of Religion amongst any other People ever promised so singular a Distinction; no Historian ever dared to record so remarkable a Prerogative.

This being the true and acknowledged state of the case; Whenever

the Unbeliever attempts to disprove, and the Advocate of Religion to support, the divinity of the Mosaic Dispensation, the obvious question (if each be willing to bring it to a speedy decision) will be, "Whether the EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE thus prophetically promised, and afterwards historically recorded to be performed, was REAL OR PRETENDED only?"

We Believers *hold* that it was REAL: And I, as an Advocate for Revelation, undertake to *prove* it was so; employing for this purpose, as my medium, THE OMISSION OF A FUTURE STATE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS. The argument stands thus:

If Religion be necessary to civil Government, and if Religion cannot subsist, under the common dispensation of Providence, without a future state of Rewards and Punishments; so consummate a Lawgiver would never have neglected to inculcate the belief of such a state, had he not been well assured that an EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE was indeed to be administered over his People: Or were it possible he had been so infatuated, the impotency of a Religion wanting a future state must very soon have concluded in the destruction of his Republic: Yet nevertheless it flourished and continued sovereign for many ages.

These two proofs of the proposition *(that an extraordinary providence was really administered)* drawn from the THING OMITTED and the PERSON OMITTING, may be reduced to the following SYLLOGISMS.

I. Whatsoever Religion and Society have no future State for their support, must be supported by an extraordinary Providence.

The Jewish Religion and Society had no future State for their support:

Therefore the Jewish Religion and Society were supported by an extraordinary Providence.

And again,

II. The Ancient Lawgivers universally believed, that a Religion without a future State could be supported only by an extraordinary Providence.

Moses, an Ancient Lawgiver, learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians (the principal branch of which wisdom was inculcating the doctrine of a future state) instituted such a Religion:

Therefore Moses believed that his Religion was supported by an extraordinary Providence.

This is the ARGUMENT OF THE DIVINE LEGATION; plain, simple, and convincing, in the opinion of the Author; a PARADOX, in the representation of his Adversaries: Attempts of this nature being still attended with the fortune they have long undergone. *William of Newbourg*, speaking of Gregory the Eighth, tells us, that he was, "Vir plane et sapientiæ et vitæ sinceritate conspicuus, æmulationem

Dei habens in omnibus *secundum scientiam;* et *superstitiosarum consuetudinum* quarum in Ecclesia per quorundam rusticam simplicitatem citra Scripturarum auctoritatem multitudo inolevit, *Reprehensor acerrimus.* Unde *a quibusdam minus discretis* putatus est turbato per nimiam abstinentiam cerebro delirare." This curious passage shews what hath been, and what is likely to be, the fate of all opposers of foolish and superstitious practices and opinions, when opposers are most wanted, that is to say, to be thought mad. Only one sees there was this difference between *William's* age and our own. In the time of good Gregory, they were the *People of least discretion* who passed this judgment on every Reformer's head-piece; whereas in our times, they are the *more discreet* who have made this discovery.

Our Author's adversaries proved to be of two sorts, FREETHINKERS and SYSTEMATICAL DIVINES. Those denied the Major of the two Syllogisms; These, the Minor: yet one could not be done without contradicting the universal voice of Antiquity; nor the other, without explaining away the sense, as well as letter, of sacred Scripture. Had it not been for this odd combination, my *Demonstration of the Divine Legation of Moses* had not only been as *strong* but as *short* too as any of Euclid's: whose theorems, as Hobbes somewhere observes, should they ever happen to be connected with the passions and interests of men, would soon become as much matter of dispute and contradiction as any moral or theological Proposition whatsoever.

It was not long, therefore, before I found that the discovery of this important Truth would engage me in a full dilucidation of the three following Propositions—

1. "That inculcating the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments, is necessary to the well-being of civil Society."

2. "That all mankind, especially the most wise and learned nations of Antiquity, have concurred in believing and teaching, that this doctrine was of such use to civil Society."

3. "That the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments is not to be found in, nor did make part of, the Mosaic Dispensation."

—Neither a short nor an easy task. The two first requiring a severe search into the *Religion,* the *Politics,* and the *Philosophy* of ancient times: And, the latter, a minute examination into the *nature and genius of the Hebrew Constitution.*

To the first part of this enquiry, therefore, I assigned the first Volume of this work; and to the other, the second.

I.

I. The *first* Volume begins with proving the MAJOR of the first Syllogism, *that whatsoever Religion and Society have no future State*

for their support, must be supported by an extraordinary Providence. In order to which, the FIRST PROPOSITION was to be inforced, That *the inculcating the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments is necessary to the well-being of Society.*

This is done in the following manner—By shewing that CIVIL SOCIETY, which was instituted as a remedy against force and injustice, falls short, in many instances, of its effects—as it cannot, by its own proper force, provide for the observance of above one third part of moral duties; and, of that third, but imperfectly: and further, which is a matter of still greater importance, that it totally wants the first of those two great hinges on which Government is supposed to turn, and without which it cannot be carried on, namely REWARD and PUNISHMENT. Some other coactive power was therefore to be added to civil Society, to supply its wants and imperfections. This power is shewn to be no other than RELIGION; which, teaching the just Government of the Deity, provides for all the natural deficiencies of civil Society. But this government, it is seen, can be no otherwise supported than by the general belief of a *future state;* or of an *extraordinary Providence,* that is, by a Dispensation of things very different from what we see administered at present.

This being proved, the discourse proceeds to remove objections.—The Reader observes, that the steps and gradations of this capital truth advance thus,—A future state is necessary as it supports Religion—Religion is necessary as it supports Morality—And Morality as it supports (though it be reciprocally supported by) civil Society, which only can procure such accommodations of life as man's nature requires. Hence I concluded, that the Doctrine of a future state was necessary to civil Society, under the present administration of Providence.

Now there are various kinds or rather degrees of LIBERTINISM. Some, though they own Morality to be necessary to Society, yet deny Religion to be necessary. Others again deny it even to Morality.—As both equally attempt to break the chain of my reasoning, both come equally under my examination. And, opportunely for my purpose, a great Name in the first instance, and a great Book, in the second, invited me to this entertainment.

1. The famous M. BAYLE had attempted to prove, that *Religion* was not necessary to Society; and that, simple *morality,* as distinguished from Religion, might well supply its place: which Morality too, an ATHEIST might compleatly possess. His arguments in support of these propositions I have carefully examined: and having occasion, when I came to the last of them, to enquire into *the true foundation of Morality,* I state all its pretences, consider all its advantages, and shew that OBLIGATION, properly so called, proceeds from

WILL, and from WILL only. This enquiry was directly to my point, as the result of it proves that the *morality* of the *Atheist* must be without any true foundation, and consequently weak and unstable. It had a further propriety, as the Religion, whose divine original I am here attempting to demonstrate, has founded *moral obligation* in *Will* only; and had a peculiar expediency likewise, as it is become the fashion of the times to seek for this *foundation* any where but there where Religion has placed it.

2. But MANDEVILLE, the Author of *the Fable of the Bees*, went a large step further; and pretended to prove that MORALITY was so far from being necessary to Society, that it was *vice* and not *virtue* which rendered states flourishing and happy. This execrable Doctrine, that would cut away my Argument by the roots, was presented to the People with much laboured art and plausible insinuation. It was necessary therefore to confute and expose it. This I have done with the same care, but with better faith than it was inforced.

In this manner I endeavoured to prove the MAJOR PROPOSITION of the first Syllogism: and with this, the first book of *the Divine Legation of Moses* concludes.

II. The second Book begins with establishing the MAJOR of the second Syllogism, *That the ancient Lawgivers universally believed that a Religion without a future state could be supported only by an extraordinary Providence.* In order to which, the SECOND PROPOSITION was to be inforced, *That all mankind, especially the most wise and learned nations of Antiquity, have concurred in believing and teaching, that the Doctrine of a future state was necessary to the well-being of civil Society.*

The proof of this proposition divides itself into two parts—The *conduct of the* LAWGIVERS; and *the opinion of the* PHILOSOPHERS.

The first part is the subject of the *present* Book; as the second part is of the *following.*

In proving this proposition from the *conduct of the Lawgivers*, I shew,

1. Their care to PROPAGATE *Religion in general*, 1. As it appears from the *effects*, the state of Religion every where in the civilized World. 2. As it appears from the *cause*, such as their universal pretence to *inspiration*, in order to instil the belief of the Divine Superintendency over human affairs; and such as their universal practice in *prefacing their Laws*, in order to establish the belief of that Superintendency. And here it should be observed, that in proving their care to propagate *Religion in general*, I prove their care to propagate the doctrine of a *future state of Rewards and Punishments;* since there never was a formed Religion in the World, the

Jewish excepted, of which this Doctrine did not make an essential part.

2. But I shew, in the second place, their care to propagate *this Doctrine*, with more than common attention and assiduity. And as the most effectual method they employed to this end was the institution of the MYSTERIES, a large account is given of their rise and progress, from Egypt into Greece, and from thence, throughout the civilized world. I have attempted to discover the ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ, or hidden doctrines of these Mysteries, which were THE UNITY OF THE GODHEAD and the ERROR OF THE GROSSER POLYTHEISM, namely, *the Worship of dead men, deified.* This discovery not only confirms all that is advanced, concerning the rise, progress, and order of the several species's of Idolatry, but clears up and rectifies much embarras and mistake even of the most celebrated Moderns, such as *Cudworth, Stillingfleet, Prideaux, Newton,* &c. who, contrary to the tenour of Holy Scripture, in order to do imaginary honour to Religion, have ventured to maintain, that *the one true God was generally known and worshiped in the Pagan World;* for, finding many, in divers countries, speaking of the *one true God*, they concluded, that he must needs have a *national Worship.* Now the Discovery of the ἀπόῤῥητα of the *Mysteries* enables us to explain the perfect consistency between sacred and prophane Antiquity; which, left to speak for themselves, concur to inform us of this plain and consistent truth, "That the Doctrine of the *one true God* was indeed taught in all places, but as a profound secret, to the FEW, in the celebration of their mysterious Rites; while, in the Land of JUDÆA alone, he had a *public and national Worship.*" For to the *Hebrew* PEOPLE *alone*, (as Eusebius expresses it) *was reserved the honour of being* INITIATED *into the knowledge of the Creator of all things.* And of this difference, God himself speaks by the Prophet,—*I have not* spoken IN SECRET, IN A DARK PLACE OF THE EARTH.* And the holy Apostle Paul informs us of the *consequence* of that *mysterious* manner of teaching the true God amongst the Pagan nations, that when, by this means, they came to the *knowledge* of him, *they glorified him not as God.*†

To confirm and illustrate my account of the MYSTERIES, I subjoin a Dissertation on *the sixth Book of Virgil's Æneis;* and another on *the metamorphosis of Apuleius.* The first of which books is shewn to be one continued description of the *Eleusinian Mysteries;* and the other to be purposely written to recommend the use and efficacy of the *Pagan Mysteries in general.*

And here the attentive Reader will observe, that throughout the course of this whole argument, on the conduct of the ancient LAW-

* Isai. xlv. 19. † Rom. i. 21.

GIVERS, it appears, that all the fundamental principles of their Policy were borrowed from EGYPT. A truth which will be made greatly subservient to the *minor* of the second Syllogism; that *Moses*, though learned in all the Wisdom of Egypt, yet *instituted the Jewish Religion and Society without a future State.*

From this, and from what has been said above of MORAL OBLIGATION, the intelligent Reader will perceive, that, throughout *the Divine Legation*, I have all along endeavoured to select for my purpose such kind of arguments, in support of the *particular* question in hand, as may, at the same time, illustrate the truth of *Revelation in general*, or serve as principles to proceed upon in the *progress of the present Argument*. Of which will be given, as occasion serves, several other instances in the course of this review.—And now having shewn the Legislators care to *propagate* Religion in general, and the Doctrine of a future state of Rewards and Punishments in particular (in which is seen their sense of the inseparable connexion between them); I go on, to explain the contrivances they employed to perpetuate the knowledge and influence of them: by which it appears that, in their opinion, RELIGION was not a temporary expedient, useful only to secure their own power and authority, but a necessary support to civil Society itself.

1. The first instance of this care was, as we shew, their ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL RELIGION, *protected by the Laws of the State*, in all places where they were concerned. But as Men, ignorant of *true Religion*, could hardly avoid falling into mistakes in contriving the *mode* of this *Establishment*, I have therefore (the subject of my Work being no idle speculation, but such a one as affects us in our highest interests, as Men and Citizens) attempted to deliver the true *Theory* of the *Alliance between Church and State*, as the best defence of the justice and equity of an ESTABLISHED RELIGION.

2. The second instance of their care, I shew to have been the allowance of a GENERAL TOLERATION; which as it would, for the like reason, be as imperfectly framed as an *Establishment*, I have ventured to give the true *Theory* of that likewise. The ancient Lawgiver contrived to *establish* one mode of Religion, by *allying* it to the State, for the sake of its DURATION: He *tolerated* other modes of it, for the sake of their INFLUENCE, for a Religion forced upon man, has none; and the Lawgiver concerns himself with Religion only for the sake of its *influence*.—Discoursing upon this Subject, I was naturally led to vindicate *true Religion* from an aspersion of Infidelity: Where, I shew, that the first persecution for Religion was not that which was *committed*, but that which was *undergone* by the Christian Church: And that the ill success attending its propagation amongst barbarous

Nations in our times, is altogether owing to the preposterous method employed for that purpose.—And with this, the second Book of the Divine Legation concludes.

III. The third Book goes on in supporting the MAJOR of the second Syllogism, by *the opinions of the* PHILOSOPHERS. For as the great waste and ravages of time have destroyed most of the Monuments of ancient *Legislation*, I held it not improper to strengthen my position of the sense of their Lawgivers, by that of their Sages and Philosophers. In this is shewn,

1. From their own words, the conviction they in general had of the necessity of the doctrine of *a future state of Rewards and Punishments* to civil society. And, to set this conviction in the strongest light, I endeavour to prove, that even such of them (viz. the several sects of Grecian Philosophers) who did not believe *a future state of Rewards and Punishments*, did yet, for the sake of Society, diligently teach and propagate it.—That they *taught* it, is confessed; that they did *not believe* it, was my business to prove: which I have done by shewing, 1. That they all thought it lawful to say one thing, and think another. 2. That they constantly practised what they thus thought to be lawful: and, 3. That they practised it on the very Doctrine in question.—To explain and verify the two first of these assertions, I had occasion to enquire into the rise, progress, perfection, decline, and genius of the ancient *Greek Philosophy*, under all its several divisions. In which, (as its rise and progress are shewn to have been from *Egypt)* still more materials are laid in for inforcing the *minor* proposition of the second Syllogism.—I then proceed to a *more particular* inquiry into the sentiments of each sect of Philosophy, on this point; and shew from the character and genius of each School, and from the Writings of each man, that none of them did indeed believe the Doctrine of *a future state of Rewards and Punishments*. At the same time it appears, from almost every proof brought for this purpose, that they all thought the Doctrine to be of the highest utility to the State.—Here, in examining the philosophy of PYTHAGORAS, the subject led me, to consider his so celebrated *Metempsychosis;* in which, I take occasion to speak of the *origin of the Pagan Fables*, and the nature of the *Metamorphosis of Ovid*, here shewn to be *a Popular History of Providence*, very regularly and artfully deduced from the most early times to his own: From the whole I draw this conclusion, "that Pythagoras, who so sedulously propagated this species of a future state of Rewards and Punishments (the *Metempsychosis)* that he was thought by some to be the author of it, considered it only as a commodious Fable to restrain the unruly populace."

2. To support this fact, it is shewn, in the next place, that these

Philosophers not only *did not*, but that they *could not* possibly believe the Doctrine of a future state of Rewards and Punishments, because the belief of it contradicted two Metaphysical principles universally held and *believed* by them, concerning the nature of GOD and of the SOUL; which were, that *the Deity could not hurt any one;* and that *the soul was part of the substance of the Deity, and resolvable again into him.* In explaining and verifying their reception of this latter principle, I take occasion to speak of its original; which, I prove, was *Grecian* and not *Egyptian;* as appears from the genius and character of the two Philosophies; though the spurious books going under the name of *Hermes*, but indeed written by the later Platonists, would persuade us to the contrary. The use of this inquiry likewise (i. e. concerning the *origin* of this principle) will be seen when we come to settle the *character of Moses*, as aforesaid.—But, with regard to the *belief* of the Philosophers on both points, besides the direct and principal use of it, for the support of the *major* of the second Syllogism, it hath (as I said before, it was contrived my arguments should have) two further uses; the one, to serve as a principle in the progress of my general Argument: the other, to illustrate the truth of Revelation in general. For, 1st, it will be a sufficient answer to that solution of the Deists, (to be considered hereafter) that *Moses did not teach the Doctrine of a future state because he did not believe it*, since it is shewn by the strongest evidence, that the not believing a doctrine so useful to Society, was esteemed no reason why the Legislator should not propagate it. 2. It is a convincing proof of the *expediency* of the Gospel of Jesus, that the sages of Greece, with whom all the wisdom of the Wise was supposed to be deposited, had *philosophised* themselves out of one of the most evident and useful truths with which mankind has any concern; and a full *justification* of the severity with which the holy Apostles always speak of the *Philosophers* and the *Philosophy of Greece*, since it is hereby seen to be directed only against these pernicious principles; and not, as *Deists* and *Fanatics* concur to represent it, a condemnation of human learning in general.

3. But as now, it might be objected, "that by this representation, we lose on the one hand what we gain on the other; and that while we shew the *expediency* of the Gospel, we run a risque of discrediting its *reasonableness;* for that nothing can bear harder upon this latter quality, than that the best and wisest persons of Antiquity did not believe that which the Gospel was sent to propagate, namely, the Doctrine of a future state of Rewards and Punishments." As this, I say, might be objected, we have given (besides explaining on what absurd principles their *unbelief* rested) a further answer; and, to support this answer, shewn, that the two extremes into which Divines

have usually run, in representing the state and condition of *revealed Religion*, are attended with great and real mischiefs to it; while the only view of Antiquity, which yields solid advantage to the Christian Cause, is such a one as is here represented for the true: Such a one as shews *natural Reason* to be *clear* enough to *perceive* TRUTH, and the necessary deductions from it *when proposed*, but not generally *strong* enough to *discover* it. He, who of all the Pagan World best knew its force, and was in that very state in which only a true judgment could be passed, has with the greatest ingenuity confessed this truth, "Nam neque tam est acris acies in naturis hominum et ingeniis, ut res tantas quisquam, nisi monstratas, possit videre; neque tanta tamen in rebus obscuritas, ut easnon penitus acri vir ingenio cernat, si modo aspexerit." In explaining this matter, it is occasionally shewn, that the great and acknowledged superiority of the modern Systems of *Deistical Morality* above the ancient, in point of excellence, is entirely owing to the unacknowledged, and perhaps unsuspected, aid of Revelation.

Thus the Reader sees, in what manner we have endeavoured to prove the MAJOR PROPOSITIONS of the two Syllogisms, that *whatsoever Religion and Society have no future State for their support, must be supported by an extraordinary Providence.* And that, *The ancient Lawgivers universally believed, that a Religion without a future State could be supported only by an extraordinary Providence.* For having shewn, that Religion and Society were unable, and believed to be unable, to support themselves under an *ordinary Providence*, without a future State; if they were supported without that Doctrine, it could be, and could be believed to be, only by an *extraordinary Providence.*

But now as the proof is conducted through a long detail of circumstances, shewing the *absolute necessity* of *Religion* to civil Society; and the *sense* which all the wise and learned amongst the ancients had of that necessity; lest this should be abused to countenance the idle and impious Conceit that RELIGION WAS THE INVENTION OF POLITICIANS, I concluded the third Book and the Volume together, with proving that the Conceit is both IMPERTINENT and FALSE.

1. *Impertinent*, for that, were this account of the origin of Religion true, it would not follow, that the thing itself was visionary; but, on the contrary, most real, evidently so even from that *universal utility*, on which this its pretended origin is supported. Indeed, against this *utility*, paradoxical men, or men in a paradoxical humour, have often reasoned; such as BAYLE, PLUTARCH, and BACON: Their arguments are here examined: And the *Master sophism*, which runs through the reasoning of all three, is detected and exposed.

2. *False;* for that, in fact, *Religion* existed before the *civil Magistrate* was in being. In proving this point, the matter led me to

speak of the *origin of Idolatry;* to distinguish the several species of it; to adjust the order in which they arose out of one another; and to detect the ends of the later Platonists, in their attempts to turn the whole into an ALLEGORY (in which the reasonings of a late Writer in his *Letters concerning Mythology* are considered). And because the rage of ALLEGORISING had spread a total confusion over all this matter, The origin, and progress of the folly, and the various views of its sectators in supporting it, are here accounted for and explained.

But my end and purpose in all this, was not barely to remove an objection against the Truths delivered in this place, but to prepare a reception for those which are to *follow:* For if Religion were so useful to Society, and yet not the invention of the Magistrate, we must seek for its original in another quarter; either from NATURE or REVELATION, or from BOTH.

Such is the subject-matter of the FIRST Volume of *The Divine Legation:* which, as it was thought proper to publish separately, I contrived should not only contain a *part* of that general Argument, but should likewise be a complete Treatise of itself, establishing one of the most important Truths with which Man has any concern; namely, THE NECESSITY OF RELIGION FOR THE SUPPORT OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT. And if, in support of this truth, I have entered into a long detail of some capital articles of Antiquity, I presume I shall not need an apology.

II.

We come now to the SECOND VOLUME of *The Divine Legation,* which is employed in proving the MINOR PROPOSITION of the two Syllogisms; the first, that the *Jewish Religion and Society had no future state for their support:* the other, that *Moses, an ancient Lawgiver, and learned in all the Wisdom of Egypt, purposely instituted such a Religion,* in order to which the THIRD GENERAL PROPOSITION was to be enforced; That *the Doctrine of a future state of Rewards and Punishments is not to be found in, nor did make part of, the Mosaic Dispensation.* But in proving the MINOR, a method something different from that observed in proving the MAJOR PROPOSITIONS was to be followed. *These,* in the first Volume, were proved *successively* and in order. But here the MINOR PROPOSITIONS are inforced all the way *together.* And this difference arises from the reason of the thing; the facts, brought to prove the doctrine to be omitted, do, at the same time, *accidentally* shew that the Omission was designed: And the reasons, brought to prove the uses in a designed omission, *necessarily* shew that the Doctrine was omitted.

To proceed therefore with the subject of the SECOND VOLUME.

IV. I just before observed, that the conclusion of the first Volume, which detected the absurdity and falsity of the Atheistic Principle, that *Religion was an invention of Politicians, and a creature of the state*, opened the way to a fair inquiry whether its true original was not as well from REVELATION as from NATURAL REASON.

In the introduction therefore to this second Volume, I took the advantage which that opening afforded me, of shewing that the universal pretence to *Revelation* proves *some* Revelation must be true: That this *true* Revelation must have some characteristic marks to distinguish it from the *false*: And that these *marks* are to be found in the Institutions of MOSES.

But this was only by way of *introduction*; and to lead the Reader more easily into the main road of our inquiry; by shewing that we pursued no desperate adventure, while we endeavoured to deduce the *divinity* of Moses's Law from the circumstances of the Law itself.

I proceeded then to the proof of the MINOR PROPOSITIONS, that *the Jewish Religion and Society had no future State for their support*: and that *Moses, an ancient Lawgiver, and learned in all the wisdom of Egypt, purposely instituted such a Religion*. To evince these truths with sufficient evidence, the *nature* of that Institution was to be first understood; which again required a general knowledge, at least, of the *manners* and *genius* of the Hebrew People, and of the *character* and *abilities* of their Lawgiver. Now these having been entirely fashioned on Egyptian models, it was further expedient that we should know *the state of Egyptian superstition and learning* in that early period.

1. In order to this, the following proposition is advanced, that *the Egyptian learning celebrated in Scripture, and the Egyptian superstition there condemned, were the very learning and superstition represented by the Greek Writers as the honour and opprobrium of that kingdom*. Where I first state the question; and then shew the equal extravagance of each of those two parties amongst the learned, who have been accustomed to *advance* or to *depress* the high antiquity of Egypt.

1. I corroborate the Proposition, first, by FACT, the testimony of holy Scripture, and of the ancient Greek Writers, set together and supporting one another; and both supported by circumstances regarding the peculiar situation of the land of Egypt. And here the *objections* of the author of *the Sacred and Prophane History of the World connected*, frightened by the common panic of the high antiquity of Egypt, are confuted and exposed.

Secondly, by REASON, in an argument drawn from the nature, origin, and various uses of their so famed HIEROGLYPHICS. Where it is shewn,

1. That this species of writing was employed by the Egyptians as the vehicle of learning, even *after* the invention of LETTERS: for which no good reason can be assigned but this, that they were applied to the same purpose *before*. Now LETTERS were in use amongst them before the time of *Moses*.

2. Again, it is shewn that the ONIROCRITICS borrowed their art of deciphering dreams from *hieroglyphic Symbols:* but *hieroglyphic Symbols* were the mysterious vehicle of the civil science and of the Theology of the Egyptians. Now ONIROCRITIC or the art of interpreting of dreams was practised in the time of Joseph.

3. And again, It is shewn that ANIMAL-WORSHIP in Egypt arose from the mysterious use of the same *hieroglyphic Symbols*. Now ANIMAL-WORSHIP was established amongst them before the time of *Moses*.

From all this, it appears, that EGYPT was of that high antiquity which *Scripture* and the best *Greek* Writers concur to represent it. By which, we come to understand what were the *specific manners and superstitions* of Egypt in the time of Moses; these being, as it now appears, identically the same with what the Greek Writers have delivered to us.

In the course of this proof from *Reason*, which opens at large the nature, origin, and various kinds of EGYPTIAN HIEROGLYPHICS, I interweave (as the explanation of my subject necessarily required) a detailed history of the various modes of ancient communication amongst men, as well by *real* and *literary* characters, as by *words* and *action;* and shew how SPEECH and WRITING ran parallel in their progress; and influenced, and were influenced by, one another. On the same account, when I come to the origin of BRUTE-WORSHIP, I give the history of the various modes of ancient Idolatry, in the order in which they rose, one out of another.

These things I have not only made to serve in support of the question I am *here* upon, but likewise in support of one question *preceding*, and of one which is to *follow*.

For in the history of the *various modes of ancient communication* was laid, as the Reader will find, the foundation of my discourses on the *nature of ancient Prophecies* in the sixth Book.

And, in the history of *the various modes of ancient Idolatry*, the Reader hath a necessary supplement to what had been said before on the same subject, in the latter end of the third Book, against the Atheist's pretended origin of Religion.

So studious have I been to observe, what a great master of Reason lays down as the *rule* and *test* of good order in Composition, *That every former part may give strength to all that follow; and every latter bring light unto all before.**

* HOOKER.

But the *high antiquity of Egypt*, though proved from *Antiquity* itself, seemed not to be enough secured, while the authority of one *great modern* remained entire, and his reasonings unanswered.

In the next place, therefore, I examine Sir ISAAC NEWTON'S *Chronology of the Egyptian Empire;* a Chronology erected on the supposed *identity of Osiris and Sesostris;* which is a fancy that not only contradicts all *sacred* as well as *prophane* antiquity, but, what is still more, the very *nature of things.*

In the course of this confutation, *the causes of that endless confusion in the early Greek history and Mythology,* are inquired into and explained: Which serves, at the same time, to confirm and illustrate all that hath been occasionally said in the latter end of the *third* book, and, here again, in this *fourth*, concerning—the origin and progress of Idolatry—the genius of Pagan Religion—the Gentile modes of worship—and their Theological opinions.

Thus far concerning *the high antiquity of Egypt.* Which, besides the *immediate* purpose of leading us into the true idea of the *Jewish Institution* in general, hath these further uses:

We have seen, in the foregoing Volume, that EGYPT, as it was most famed for the arts of legislation, so it most of all inculcated the doctrine of *a future state of Rewards and Punishments.* Now, if Egypt were indeed of the high antiquity here assigned unto it, that doctrine must needs be of national belief, at the time the Hebrews lived there in slavery. But then they having, as we find in Scripture, thoroughly imbibed the religious notions of the place, must needs be much prejudiced in favour of so reasonable and flattering a Doctrine: Consequently their Lawgiver, who likewise had been bred up in all the learning of Egypt, would, if he had acted only by human direction, have, in imitation of his Masters, taken advantage of this favourable prejudice to make the doctrine of a future state the grand SANCTION of his Religion and Law.

Again, the proof of the *high Antiquity of Egypt* was necessary to vindicate *sacred Scripture;* which all along declares for that Antiquity; and which the DEIST having endeavoured to take advantage of, in opposing Moses's pretence to inspiration, some imprudent BELIEVERS were grown not unwilling to explain away. Sir Isaac Newton's CHRONOLOGY afforded them the aid they wanted: And while it offered itself in support of the *Bible-divinity*, they seemed little attentive to the liberties it had taken with the *Bible-history.*

2. In order to bring on this Truth of the *high antiquity of Egypt* nearer to my purpose, I proceeded to the *second* Proposition, *That the Jewish People were extremely fond of Egyptian manners, and did frequently fall into Egyptian superstitions: and that many of the Laws given to them by the ministry of Moses were instituted partly*

in compliance to their prejudices, and partly in opposition to those superstitions. In the proof of the first part of this Proposition, I shew the high *probability* that the Law was instituted with reference to Egyptian manners; and through the proof of the second, is deduced a *demonstration* that it was actually so framed.

For a further illustration of this Argument, I give an historical account of the degeneracy of the Hebrew People, and of their amazing propensity to imitate the manners of Egypt, from the time that Moses was first sent upon his Mission, to their entire settlement in the land of Judea: Which fully shews (what will stand us in stead hereafter) that a People so perverse and headstrong needed, in the construction of their civil and religious Institutions, all possible curbs to disorder: Now of all such curbs, the doctrine of a *future state* was ever held the chief in ancient policy; and as this doctrine was so peculiarly Egyptian, they must needs have the most favourable prejudice towards it.

But then, as it might perhaps be objected, that while I am endeavouring to get this way into the interior of the Jewish Constitution, I open a back door to the ravages of Infidelity: it was thought necessary, in order to prevent the Deist's taking advantage of the great Truth contained in the preceding Proposition (which is the second), to guard it by the following (which is the third), viz. *That Moses's Egyptian Learning, and the Laws instituted in compliance to the Peoples prejudices, are no reasonable objection to the divinity of his Mission.* Where, in explaining the *first part*, which shews what this learning was, and how well it suited with Moses's Mission, I had occasion to inquire into the origin and use of the SCHOOLS OF THE PROPHETS: Which the Reader will find of this further use, viz. To give strength and support to what is said in the sixth Book of the NATURE OF THE JEWISH PROPHECIES; and particularly to what is there observed of GROTIUS'S fatal error, in his mode of interpreting them.

And in explanation of the *second part*, having proved the Proposition, That to institute Laws in compliance to popular prejudices is no reasonable objection to their divine original; having proved this, I say, from the nature of things; the Discourse proceeds to examine all the Arguments which have been urged in support of the contrary opinion, by HERMAN WITSIUS, in his learned Treatise intitled *Ægyptiaca*, that Book having been publicly recommended by Dr. *Waterland*, for *a distinct and solid confutation of Spencer's De Legibus Hebræorum ritualibus.*

And the answer to Witsius's last argument bringing into question the intrinsic value of the *ritual Law;* the famous character of it given by the Prophet EZEKIEL, *of statutes that were not good, and*

judgments whereby they should not live—is explained in a large analysis of the whole Prophecy, against an old foolish notion revived by Dr. Shuckford, that these *Statutes* and *Judgments*, here said to be *given* by God, were the *Pagan Idolatries*, which, in defiance of God, they took without leave.

But I go yet further in support of the fourth Proposition, and prove, that *these very circumstances of Moses's Egyptian Learning, and the Laws instituted in compliance to the People's prejudices, are a strong confirmation of the divinity of his Mission.*

1st, For, that one bred up in the arts of Egyptian Legislation could never, on his own head, have thought of reducing an unruly people to government, on maxims of Religion and Policy, fundamentally opposite to all the principles of Egyptian WISDOM, at that time the universal Model on which all the Legislators worked, in reducing a barbarous People to Society. Yet Moses went upon principles diametrically opposite to that WISDOM, when he enjoined the PUBLIC worship of the *one true God only*, and OMITTED *the doctrine of a future state of Rewards and Punishments*, in the institution of his Law and Religion.

2dly, For, that One who *falsely* pretended to receive the whole frame of a national Constitution from God, would never have risqued his pretensions by a *ritual Law*, which the people might see was politically instituted, partly in compliance to their prejudices, and partly in opposition to Egyptian superstitions.

Here, all the imaginable motives are inquired into, which MOSES, though a mere human Lawgiver, might have had to act in the manner he did; and these motives are shewn to be insufficient to induce a wise Legislator thus to act.—In conclusion, it is made apparent, *that a ritual, contrived to oppose to the reigning superstitions;* and, at the same time, *to prefigure, by its typical nature*, all the essential parts of a future Dispensation, contains a strong INTERNAL ARGUMENT THAT THE RITUAL LAW WAS NOT A MERE HUMAN INVENTION. And with this the fourth Book concludes.

V. What hath been hitherto said, was to let the Reader into the genius of the Jewish Policy in *general*, in order to his judging more exactly of the *peculiar nature* of its Government; that, from thence, he might be enabled to determine, with full certainty, of the matters in question, as they are contained in the two MINOR terms.

1. The *fifth Book*, therefore, comes still nearer to the point, and shews, that the Government instituted by Moses was a THEOCRACY, properly so called, where God himself was the supreme civil Magistrate. It begins with assigning and settling the true reason of the separation of the posterity of Abraham from the rest of mankind;—because this separation has been greatly misunderstood—but princi-

pally because the true reason of the *separation* leads us into the use and necessity of a *Theocratic* form of Government.

In evincing this necessity, the justice *of the Law for punishing Idol-worship capitally*, under a Theocracy, is explained: And because the Deist hath been accustomed to urge *this Law* against the divine original of the whole Institution, it is here justified at large, on the principles of natural equity: Which serves, as well a past purpose, viz. the adding strength and support to what hath been said on the subject of TOLERATION, in the second Book; as it does a present, viz. to confirm the *reality of this Theocracy*, which a celebrated dissenting Minister has preposterously gone out of his way to bring in question: whose *reasoning*, therefore, is examined and exposed.

2. This THEOCRACY, thus proved to be *necessary*, was likewise of the most easy introduction, as I have shewn from the notions and opinions of those times, concerning *tutelary Deities*. And here, speaking of the method of divine Providence, in applying the prejudices and manners of men to the great ends of his Dispensations, I observe, that He is always accustomed to impress on his institution, some characteristic note of difference, to mark it for his own: which leading me to give instances in some of these *notes*, I insist chiefly upon this, "that the Mosaic Religion was *built upon a former*, namely, the Patriarchal: whereas the various Religions of the Pagan World were all unrelated to, and independent of, one another." As this was a circumstance necessary to be well attended to, by all who would fully comprehend the nature of the Mosaic Policy, I took the advantage, which the celebrated Author of the *Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion* had afforded me, to support this characteristic note, against his idle attempt to prove, that the Pagans, likewise, were accustomed to build one pretended Revelation on another.

3. I proceed, in the next place, to shew, that those prejudices which made the *introduction of a* THEOCRACY *so easy*, occasioned *as easy a defection from it*. In which, I had occasion to explain the nature of the *worship of tutelary Gods;* and of that *Idolatry* wherewith the Israelites were so obstinately besotted.

Both of which Discourses serve these further purposes: the *former*, to support and explain what hath been said in the second Book concerning the *Pagan intercommunity of worship:* and the *latter*, (besides a peculiar use to be made of it in the third volume*) to obviate a popular objection of Unbelievers: who, from this circumstance, of the perpetual defection of the Israelites into idolatry, would infer, that God's Dispensation to them could never have been so convictive as their History represents it; the Objectors having taken it for granted, on the allowance of Believers, that this Idolatry consisted in renounc-

* See note in p. 266 of this volume.

ing the Law of Moses, and renouncing it as dissatisfied with its truth. Both which suppositions are here shewn to be false. This affords an occasion to confute the false reasoning of Lord Bolingbroke; who, from this frequent lapse into Idolatry, infers such a defect and political inability in the Law, as shews its pretence to a divine original to be an imposture.

4. The nature of the THEOCRACY, and the circumstances attending its *erection*, being thus explained, we come next to inquire concerning its *duration*. Here we shew, that, in strict truth and propriety, it subsisted throughout the whole period of the Jewish œconomy, even to the coming of Christ: In which discourse, the contrary opinions, of an earlier abolition, are all considered and confuted, and the above truth supported and established. In the course of this reasoning, it is shewn, that the famous Prophecy of Jacob, of the *Sceptre's not departing from Judah till the coming of Shiloh*, is a promise or declaration of the existence of the THEOCRACY till the coming of Christ. And as the truth of this interpretation is of the highest importance to Revelation, all the different senses given to this Prophecy are examined, and shewn to be erroneous. And the last of them being one borrowed by Dr. Sherlock, Bishop of London, and received into his Book of *the Use and Intent of Prophecy*, is particularly discussed.

The use to be hereafter made of *the duration of the Theocracy to the coming of Christ*, is to inforce, by this circumstance, amongst many others, the CONNEXION between the two Religions: a truth, though too much neglected, yet incumbent on every rational Defender of Revelation to support.

The Argument then proceeds to a consideration of the *peculiar consequences* attending the administration of a Theocracy, which brings us yet nearer to our point. Here it is shewn, that one necessary *consequence* was an EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE. And agreeably to this deduction from the *nature of things*, we find, that holy Scripture does, *in fact*, exhibit this very representation of God's Government of Judea; and that there are many favourable circumstances in the character of the Hebrew People, to induce us to believe the representation to be true. Here, many cloudy cavils of the three Doctors, SYKES, STEBBING, and RUTHERFORD, are occasionally removed and dispersed. But the attentive Reader will observe, that my Argument does not require me to prove more in this place, than that holy Scripture REPRESENTS an *extraordinary Providence* to have been administered. The proof of its REAL Administration is established by the MEDIUM of my Thesis, *the omission of the Doctrine of a future state of Rewards and Punishments*. Which answers all objections as to our inadequate conceptions of such an administration; as well as to certain passages of Scripture that seem to clash with its general representation of it. Yet both these sort of objections are, however, considered *ex abundanti*.

As important as the fact is, to our present purpose of an extraordinary Providence thus represented, it has still a further use, when employed amongst those distinguishing *marks* of the truth of Moses's divine Mission in general: for it shews us, the unnecessary trouble and hazard to which he exposed himself had that Mission been feigned. Had he, like the rest of the ancient Lawgivers, only pretended to *inspiration*, he had then no occasion to propagate the belief of an *extraordinary Providence;* a Dispensation so easy to be confuted. But by deviating from their practice, and announcing to his People, that their *tutelary God* was become their KING, he laid himself under a necessity of teaching an *extraordinary Providence;* a dead weight upon an Impostor, which nothing but downright folly could have brought him to undergo.

To proceed. After having laid this strong and necessary Foundation, we come at length DIRECTLY to the point in question. If the Jewish Government were a THEOCRACY, administered, as it must be, by an *extraordinary Providence*, the next consequence is, that TEMPORAL REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, and not FUTURE, were the SANCTION of their Law and Religion. Thus far, therefore, have our considerations on the *nature alone* of the Jewish Government conducted us: and it is almost to our journey's end: for it fairly brings us up to the proof of our two MINOR Propositions. So necessary, as the Reader now sees, is the long discourse *of the nature of the Jewish Government.*

But, to prevent all cavil, the Argument goes on, and proves in the next place, that the Doctrine of *a future state of Rewards and Punishments*, which could not, from the *nature* of things, be the SANCTION of the Jewish Œconomy, was not in *fact* contained in it at all: nay further, that it was PURPOSELY OMITTED by the great Lawgiver. This is proved from several passages in the Book of *Genesis* and the *Law*.

And here, more fully to evince, that Moses, who, it is seen, *studiously* omitted the mention of it, was *well apprised* of its importance, I shew, that the PUNISHMENT OF CHILDREN FOR THE SINS OF THEIR PARENTS was brought into this Institution purposely to afford some advantages to Government, which the Doctrine of *a future state*, as it is found in all other Societies, amply supplies. This, at the same time that it gives further strength to the position of *no future state in the Mosaic Dispensation*, gives the Author a fair occasion of vindicating the justice and equity of the Law of *punishing Children for the sins of their Parents;* and of proving the perfect agreement between MOSES and the Prophets EZEKIEL and JEREMIAH, concerning it; which hath been, in all ages, the stumbling-block of Infidelity.

But we now advance a step further, and shew, that as Moses did not teach, yea forbore to teach the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards

and Punishments, so neither had the ancient Jews, that is to say, the Body of the People, any knowledge of it. The proof is striking, and scarce to be resisted by any Party or Profession but that of the SYSTEM-MAKER. The Bible contains a very circumstantial account of this People, from the time of Moses to the great Captivity; not only the history of public occurrences, but the lives of private persons of both sexes, and of all ages, conditions, characters, and complexions; in the adventures of virgins, matrons, kings, soldiers, scholars, parents, merchants, husbandmen. They are given too in every circumstance of life; captive, victorious, in sickness and in health; in full security, and amidst impending dangers; plunged in civil business, or retired and sequestered in the service of Religion. Together with their story, we have their compositions likewise: in one place we hear their triumphal; in another, their penitential strains. Here we have their exultations for blessings received; there, their deprecations of evil apprehended: Here they urge their moral precepts to their *contemporaries;* and there again, they treasure up their Prophecies and Predictions for the use of *Posterity;* and on each, denounce the threatenings and promises of Heaven. Yet in none of these different circumstances of life, in none of these various casts of composition, do we ever find them acting on the motives, or influenced by the prospect of a FUTURE STATE: or indeed, expressing the least hopes or fears, or even common curiosity, concerning it: But every thing they do or say respects the present life only; the good and ill of which are the sole objects of their pursuits and aversions.

The strength of this argument is still further supported by a view of the *general history* of Mankind; and particularly of those nations most resembling the *Jewish* in their genius and circumstances: in which we find the Doctrine of a future state of Rewards and Punishments, was always pushing on its influence. It was their constant viaticum through life; it stimulated them to war, and spirited their songs of triumph; it made them insensible of pain, immovable in danger, and superior to the approach of death.

This is not all: We observe, that even in the *Jewish* Annals, when this Doctrine was become national, it made as considerable a figure in their History, as in that of any other nation.

It is still further urged, that this conclusion does not rest merely on the *negative silence* of the Bible-history; it is supported on the *positive* declarations contained in it; by which the sacred Writers plainly discover that there was no popular expectation of *a future state* or *Resurrection.*

From the *Old Testament* we come to the *New.* By the Writers of which it appears, that the Doctrine of a future state of Rewards and Punishments DID NOT MAKE PART of the Mosaic Dispensation.

Their evidence is divided into two parts; the *first*, proving that TEMPORAL rewards and punishments *were the sanction* of the Jewish Dispensation; The *second*, that it had *no other*. And thus, with the most direct and unexceptionable proof of the two MINOR propositions, the fifth Book concludes.

VI. But to remove, as far as possible, all the supports of prejudice against this important Truth, the sixth and last Book of this Volume is employed in examining all those texts of the *Old* and *New* Testament, which had been commonly urged to prove, that the Doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments DID MAKE PART of the Mosaic Dispensation.

And amongst those of the *Old* Testament, the famous passage of the xixth chapter of Job, concerning a *Resurrection* (as it has been commonly understood) holding a principal place, it was judged expedient, for the reasons there given, to examine that matter to the bottom. This necessarily brought on an enquiry into the NATURE and GENIUS of that Book; WHEN WRITTEN, and to WHAT PURPOSE. By the aid of which enquiry, a fair account is given of the sense of that famous Text, consistent with our general Proposition.

But the whole *Discourse on the Book of Job* hath this further use: It provides a strong support and illustration of what will be hereafter delivered concerning the GRADUAL DECAY *of the extraordinary Providence* from the time of *Saul*, to the return from the great *Captivity*.

Yet this is not all. The *Discourse* hath yet a further use, with regard to *Revelation in general*. For the explaining, How the principles of the *Gospel-Doctrine* were opened by degrees, fully obviates the calumnies of those two leaders in Infidelity, TYNDAL and COLLINS; who pretend, that the Heads and Governors of the Jews refined their old Doctrines concerning the Deity, and invented new ones: just as the *Priests* improved in knowledge, or the *People* advanced in curiosity; or as *Both* were better taught by the instructions they received from their Masters in the country whither they were led away captive.

The *discourse of Job* being of this importance, we were led to support all the parts of it, from the attacks of various Writers, who had attempted to confute it.

The rest of the Old Testament-texts are gone through with greater dispatch, being divided into two parts. 1. Such as are supposed to teach the separate existence, or, as it is called, the *immortality* of the Soul. And, 2. Such as are supposed to teach *a future state of rewards and punishments*, together with a *Resurrection of the body*. In the course of which examination, much light, it is hoped, has been thrown both on the *particular texts* and on the *general question*.

From the texts of the *Old* Testament, the Argument proceeds to examine those of the *New:* Amongst which, the famous *eleventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews* is not forgotten; the sense of which is cleared up, to oppose to the inveterate mistakes of *Systematical Divines:* And here, occasion is taken to explain the *nature of St. Paul's reasoning against the errors of the Jewish converts;* a matter of highest moment for a right understanding of this Apostle's Letters to the several Churches; and for the further illustration of the general Argument.

As in all this, nothing is taught or insinuated which opposes the doctrine of our excellent Church, common decency required that this *conformity* should be fully shewn and largely insisted on.

Having therefore, all along, gone upon this principle, "That though a future State of rewards and punishments made no part of the MOSAIC Dispensation, yet that the LAW had a SPIRITUAL meaning; though not seen or understood till the fulness of time was come. Hence the Ritual Law received the nature, and afforded the efficacy of PROPHECY: In the interim (as is shewn) *the mystery of the Gospel was occasionally revealed,* by God, to his chosen servants, the Fathers and Leaders of the Jewish Nation; and the *dawnings* of it gradually opened by the Prophets, to the people." Having, I say, gone, all the way, upon this principle, I shew, from the SEVENTH ARTICLE *of Religion,* that it is the very Doctrine of our excellent Church.

And in explaining that part of the ARTICLE which says,—*That they are not to be heard which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory Promises,* I support this doctrine by the case of ABRAHAM, *who,* our blessed Master tells us, *rejoiced to see his day, and saw it and was glad.*

Here, I attempt to prove, in illustration of this text, that the *Command to Abraham to offer Isaac* was merely an information given, at Abraham's earnest request, in a *representative action,* instead of *words,* of the REDEMPTION OF MANKIND by the great sacrifice of Christ on the Cross. Which interpretation, if it be the true one, is, I think, the noblest proof that ever was given of the HARMONY between the Old and New Testament.

From this long Dissertation, besides the immediate purpose of vindicating the Doctrine of our national Church, in its *seventh Article,* we gain these two advantages; 1. The first of which is, supporting a real and essential *connexion* between the Mosaic and the Christian Religions. 2. The other is, disposing the Deists to think more favourably of Revelation, when they see, in this interpretation of the COMMAND, all their objections to this part of Abraham's story, overthrown.

The matter being of this high importance, it was proper to fix my

interpretation on such principles as would leave no room for reasonable doubt or objection: And this was to be done by explaining the nature of those *various modes of information* in use amongst the Ancients; for which explanation, a proper ground had been laid in the discourse on the *Hieroglyphics* in the fourth Book. To all this (for the reason here given) is subjoined a continued refutation of all that Dr. Stebbing has been able to urge against this idea of the *Command*.

Nor is this all. This *Dissertation*, which affords so many new openings into the truths of *Revelation* in general, and so many additional supports to the argument of the *Divine Legation* in particular, hath another very important use. It is a necessary introduction to the long Discourse which follows, concerning PROPHECY.

In this (which is the last of the present Volume) I have attempted to clear up and vindicate the logical truth and propriety of *Types in action*, and *secondary senses in speech*: For on the truth and propriety of these depends the divine original of the ancient JEWISH PROPHECIES concerning Christ. A matter much needing a support: For though the greater part of these Prophecies confessedly relate to Jesus only in a *secondary sense*, yet had some men of name, and in the interests of Religion, through ignorance of the true origin and nature of *such senses*, rashly concurred with modern Judaism and Infidelity, to give them all up as *illogical* and *enthusiastic*, to the imminent hazard of the very foundation of CHRISTIANITY.

In the progress of this inquiry, I had occasion to examine, and was enabled, on the principles here laid down, to confute Mr. Collins's famous Work of *the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*, one of the most able and plausible books ever written amongst us, against our holy Faith; he having borrowed the Argument, and stolen all the reasoning upon it, from the most sagacious of the modern Rabbins; who pretend that none of the Prophecies can relate to Jesus in any other sense than a *secondary*; and that a *secondary sense is illogical and fanatical*.—Had I done no more, in this long work, than explain and clear up, as I have done, this much embarrassed and most important question of the Jewish Prophecies which relate to Christ, and to the Christian Dispensation, I should have thought my time and labour well employed; so necessary to the very being of our holy Faith, is the setting this matter on its true foundation. Thus much may be said in favour of this large dissertation considered in itself alone: But, as part of the Argument of the *Divine Legation* of Moses, it has these more immediate uses:

1. To shew, that those who contend, that the Christian Doctrine of a future State was revealed to the early Jews, destroy all *use and reason of a secondary sense of Prophecies*; for how shall it be cer-

tainly known, from the Prophecies themselves, that they contain *double senses*, but from this *acknowledged* truth, that the *old Law* was preparatory to, and the rudiments of, the *New?* Or how shall this relation between these *two Laws* be certainly known, but from the evidence of this *contested* truth, *that the Doctrine of a future state of Rewards and Punishments is not to be found in the Mosaic Dispensation?* So close a dependence have all these capital Principles on one another.

2. The other more immediate reason for this Dissertation on *Types and secondary Senses* was this: As I had shewn, that a future State of rewards and punishments was not revealed under any part of the Jewish Œconomy, otherwise than by *those modes* of information; it was necessary, in order to shew the *real connexion* between Judaism and Christianity (the truth of the latter Religion depending on that *real connexion)* to prove *those modes* to be logical and rational. For, as on the one hand, had the doctrine of life and immortality been *revealed* under the Mosaic Œconomy, Judaism had been *more* than a rudiment of, and preparation to, Christianity; so on the other, had no *covert* intimations, at all, been given of the doctrine, it had been *less:* that is, the dependency and connexion between the two Religions had not been sufficiently marked out and ascertained. With this Dissertation therefore, so important in its use and application, the sixth and last Book of the second Volume* concludes.

Thus the READER, at length, may see how regularly, and intently, these two Volumes have been carried on: For, though the AUTHOR (whose passion is not so much a fondness for his *own conceived argument*, as for the honour and support of Religion itself) hath neglected no fair occasion of inforcing every collateral circumstance, which might serve to illustrate the truth of *Revelation in general;* yet he never loses sight of his end, but as the precept for conducting the most regular works directs,

Semper ad eventum festinat.

This Volume too, like the first, I thought fit to publish alone, not *merely* for the same reason, that it was a compleat and entire work of itself, which *explained the nature and genius of the Jewish Constitution;* but for this additional one, that it *fairly ended and compleated the Argument.*

For the first Volume having proved the MAJOR, and the second Volume, the MINOR Propositions of the TWO SYLLOGISMS; my logic teaches me to think, that the CONCLUSION follows of course, viz. THAT THE JEWISH RELIGION AND SOCIETY WERE SUPPORTED BY AN EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE.

* See the note in page 266.

Or put it in another light,—Having proved my three principal Propositions,

I. "That the inculcating the Doctrine of a future State of rewards and punishments, is necessary to the well-being of civil Society.

II. "That all mankind, especially the most wise and learned nations of Antiquity, have concurred in believing, and teaching, that this Doctrine was of such use to civil Society.

III. "That the Doctrine of a future State of rewards and punishments is not to be found in, nor did make part of, the *Mosaic* Dispensation."

The conclusion is, that therefore THE LAW OF MOSES IS OF DIVINE ORIGINAL.

A CONCLUSION which naturally follows the premisses contained in these three propositions. Notwithstanding all this, the evidence of their truth proving so various, extending so wide, and having been drawn out to so great a length; What between *inattention* and *prejudice*, the Argument, here brought to its final issue, hath been generally understood to be left imperfect; and the Conclusion of it reserved for another Volume. Yet a very moderate share of reflection might have led the candid Reader to understand, that I had here effectually performed what I had promised, namely, TO DEMONSTRATE THE DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES. For if it be indeed proved, That the Doctrine of a future state is necessary to the well-being of civil Society, under the ordinary government of Providence —That all mankind have ever so conceived of the matter—That the Mosaic Institution was without this support, and that yet it did not want it,—What follows but that the Jewish affairs were administered by an extraordinary Providence, distributing reward and punishment with an equal hand; and consequently that the MISSION OF MOSES WAS DIVINE?

However, the complaint against the AUTHOR, for not having performed his Convention with the Public, became pretty general. To which a great deal might be said, and perhaps to little purpose. The following Tale will put it in the fairest light. In a solemn Treaty lately concluded between the Governor of one of our American Provinces and the neighbouring Savages, it had, it seems, been stipulated, that the Settlement should supply those Warrior-Tribes with a certain number of good and serviceable Muskets. Which engagement was so ill performed, that at their next general meeting, the Chiefs of the Barbarians complained, that, though indeed the Colony had sent them the number of Muskets agreed upon, yet, on examination, they were all found to be *without Locks*. This mischance (occasioned by the Muskets and the Locks being put into two different cargoes) the Governor promised should be redressed. It was redressed accord-

ingly; and the Locks sought out, and sent. He now flattered himself that all cause of umbrage was effectually removed; when, at their next meeting, he was entertained with a fresh complaint, that the Colony had fraudulently sent them *Locks without Muskets*. The truth was, this brave People, of unimpeached morals, were only defective in their military Logic: they had not the dexterity, till they were first shewn the way, to put the *major* of the Musket and the *minor* of the Musket-lock together; and from thence to draw the *concluding* trigger.

But then it will be said, "If, as is here pretended, the PREMISSES have been indeed proved, in these two Volumes, with all the detail which their importance required, and with all the evidence which a moral subject can supply; and the CONCLUSION, therefore, established with all the conviction which the Laws of logic are able to inforce; Why was another Volume promised? For no other end, as would seem, than to mislead a well-meaning Reader, in the vain pursuit of an argument already ended."

It was promised for a better purpose—*To remove all conceivable objections against the* CONCLUSION, *and to throw in every collateral light upon the* PREMISSES. For it is one thing to satisfy Truth; and another, to silence her pretended friends. He who defends *Revelation* has many prejudices to encounter; but he who defends it by *Reason* only, has many more.

III.

The third and last Volume, therefore, is destined to SUPPORT what hath been already proved: not, as has been absurdly suggested, to continue and conclude an unfinished Argument.

It consists of three Books, like each of the preceding Volumes.

1. The seventh Book therefore is employed in supporting the MAJOR and the MINOR Propositions of the first Syllogism: in a continued History of the RELIGIOUS OPINIONS of the Jews, from the time of the earlier *Prophets*, who first gave some dark intimations of a different Dispensation, to the time of the *Maccabees*, when the Doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments was become national.

2. The eighth Book is employed in supporting the MAJOR and MINOR Propositions of the second Syllogism, in which is considered the PERSONAL CHARACTER of Moses and the GENIUS OF THE LAW, as far as it concerns or has a relation to the character of the Lawgiver. Under this latter head, is contained a full and satisfactory Answer to those who may object, "That a revealed Religion with a future state of rewards and punishments is unworthy the Divine Author to whom it is ascribed."

3. The ninth and last Book explains at large the nature and

genius of the CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION: For having, towards the end of the eighth book, examined the PRETENDED REASONS (offered both by Believers and Unbelievers to evade my conclusion) for omitting the Doctrine of a future State of rewards and punishments in the Mosaic Dispensation, I was naturally and necessarily led to inquire into the TRUE. For now, it might be finally objected, "That though, under an extraordinary Providence, there might be *no occasion* for the doctrine of a future State, in support of Religion, or for the ends of Government; yet as that Doctrine is a *truth*, and consequently, under every regimen of Providence, *useful*, it seems hard to conceive, that the Religious Leader of the Jews, because as a *Lawgiver* he could do without it, that therefore, as a *Divine*, he would omit it." The objection is of weight in itself, and receives additional moment from what hath been observed in the fifth Book, concerning *the Reason of the Law of punishing children for the crimes of their Parents.* I held it therefore insufficient barely to reply, "*Moses omitted it, that his Law might thereby stand, throughout all ages, an invincible Monument of the truth of his pretences:*" but proceeded to explain the GREAT AND PRINCIPAL reason of the *omission.* And now,—*ventum ad* VERUM *est.*

The whole concludes with one general but distinct view of the entire course of God's universal Œconomy from Adam to Christ. In which it is shewn, that if Moses were, in truth, sent from God, *he could not teach* a future State: that Doctrine being out of his Commission, and reserved for him who was at the head of another Dispensation, by which *life and immortality was to be brought to light.*

This Discourse, besides the immediate purpose of supporting and illustrating the ARGUMENT here compleated, serves another end, which I had in view, as to the general disposition of the whole work: which was to explain and discriminate the distinct and various natures of the PAGAN, the JEWISH, and the CHRISTIAN Religions: the *Pagan* having been considered in the first Volume, and the *Jewish* in the second; the *Christian* is reserved for the third* and last. Let me conclude therefore, in an address to my Reverend Brethren, with the words of an Ancient Apologist:† "Quid nobis invidemus, si veritas Divinitatis nostri temporis Ætate maturuit? Fruamur bono nostro, et recti sententiam temperemus: cohibeatur SUPERSTITIO, IMPIETAS expietur, VERA RELIGIO reservetur."

* As the first and second volumes of the Edition alluded to contained Books I. to VI., the THIRD volume was intended to comprise the Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth; but the Seventh and Eighth Books were never composed. (See *Life of the Author*, vol. i. pp. 49—54, of this Edition.) The Ninth Book forms the concluding part of this volume.—EDIT. † MINUCIUS FELIX.

APPENDIX

CONCERNING THE BOOK OF JOB.

An excellent Writer having *freely and candidly examined* the late Bishop of London's collection of Sermons, and in page 165 of his *Examination*, asked this question, *Where was Idolatry ever punished by the Magistrate, but under the Jewish Œconomy?* The Oxford Professor, in the second Edition of his *Prelections, concerning the sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, thinks fit to give the following answer—"It was punished under the Œconomy of the Patriarchs, in the families and under the DOMINION of Abraham, Melchisedec and JOB. Idolatry spreading wider and wider, Abraham was called by God from Chaldea, for this end, to be the father of a People, which, divided from all others, might continue to worship the true God; to be set up for an exemplar of true Religion, and to be ready to give testimony against the worship of vain Deities. Was not Abraham, therefore (exercising the SOVEREIGNTY in his own family) to punish Idolatry? Were not Melchisedec and Job, and all the SOVEREIGNS of Tribes of that time, who still retained the knowledge and worship of the true God, amidst a general defection of all the surrounding People, to take care that their own did not backslide? To curb offenders, and to inflict punishment on the obstinate, the REBELLIOUS, and on all those who spread abroad the contagion of this vice."—"Ad quæstionem respondetur: Sub œconomia Patriarcharum; in familiis, et sub DOMINATU Abrahami, Melchizedechi, Jobi, cæterorumque. Ingruente Idololatria divinitus evocabatur ex Chaldæa Abrahamus: eum in finem, ut fieret pater Gentis, quæ ab aliis omnibus divisa, verum Deum coleret, publicum proponeret exemplum puræ religionis, contraque cultum vanorum numinum testimonium perhiberet. Nonne erat igitur Abrahami in sua familia PRINCIPATUM exercentis proprium officium et munus in Idololatriam animadvertere? Nonne Melchizedechi, Jobi, omniumque tunc temporis in suis Tribubus PRINCIPUM, qui veri Dei cognitionem et cultum in communi fere gentium circumvicinarum defectione adhuc retinebant, cavere, ne sui deficerent; coercere delinquentes; obstinatos et REBELLES, et sceleris contagionem propagantes, supplicio afficere?"—*Supplementum ad primam Prælectionum Editionem: Addit. Editionis secundæ*, p. 312.

This is so pleasant an answer, and so little needing the masterly hand of the *Examiner*, to correct, that a few strictures, in a cursory Note, will be more than sufficient to do the business.

1. The *Examiner*, to prove, I suppose, that the book of Job was a dramatic work, written long after the time of the Patriarch, asks, *Where was Idolatry ever punished by the* MAGISTRATE, *but under the Jewish Œconomy?*

The *Professor* answers, *It was punished under the* JOBEAN ŒCONOMY. And he advances nothing without proof. Does not Job himself say, that Idolatry was *an iniquity to be punished by the Judge?* The *Examiner* replies, that the Job who says this, is an airy Fantom, raised for other purposes than to lay down the Law for the Patriarchal times. The *Professor* maintains that they are all Asses, with ears as long as *Father Harduin's*, who cannot see that this is the true and genuine old Job.—In good time. '*Sub Judice lis est:* And while it is so, I am afraid the learned *Professor* BEGS THE QUESTION; when, to prove that Idolatry was punished by the Magistrate, out of the land of Judea, he affirms that KING JOB punished it. If he say, he does not rest his assertion on this passage of the book of Job alone, but on the sacred Records, from whence he concludes that those CIVIL MAGISTRATES, Abraham and Melchisedec, punished Idolatry; I shall own he acts fairly, in putting them all upon the same footing; and on what ground that stands, we shall now see.

2. The *Examiner* says, *Where was Idolatry ever punished by the Magistrate, but under the Jewish Œconomy?* A question equivalent to this,—"Where was Idolatry punished by the civil Magistrate on the established Laws of the State, but in Judea? To which, the *Professor* replies, "It was punished by all the Patriarchal Monarchs, by king Job, king Abraham, and king Melchisedec."

Of a noble race was Shenkin.

But here, not one, save the last, had so much as a nominal title to civil Magistracy: And this last drops, as it were, from the clouds, without lineage or parentage; so that, though of *divine*, yet certainly not a Monarch of the true stamp, by *hereditary right.* The Critic therefore fails in his first point, which is, finding out civil Magistrates to do his hierarchical drudgery.

3. But let us admit our *Professor's* right of investiture, to confer this high office, and then see how he proves, that these his Lieges punished the crime of Idolatry by civil punishment. ABRAHAM, and the Patriarchs his descendants, come first under consideration. *What!* (says he) *was not Abraham, exercising the* SOVEREIGNTY *in his own family, to punish Idolatry?* Hobbes is, I believe, the only one (save our Professor) who holds that "Abraham had a right to prescribe to his family what Religion they should be of, to tell them what was the word of God, and to punish those who countenanced any Doctrine which he had forbidden." *Leviath.* chap. 40.—But God speaking of Abraham, says, *I know that he will command his children, and his houshold after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, &c.* Gen. xviii. 19. And Hobbes and our *Professor*, I suppose, regard this declaration as a clear proof of the divine doctrine of RESTRAINT in matters of Religion; especially when interpreted by their darling text of—*force them to enter in.* On the contrary, those who have been bred up in the Principles of *Toleration*, hold it to be a mere testimony (a glorious one indeed) of Abraham's pious and parental care to INSTRUCT his family in the Law of God. And it is well it can go for no more, or I should fear the learned

Professor would have brought in Isaac as a backslider to Idolatry ; and his Father's laying him on the sacrificial Pile, as a kind of *Auto de fe*. Now except in these two places of Abraham's History, of such wonderful force to support *intolerant* principles, the Patriarch appears in all others so averse to this inquisitorial spirit, that where God comes down to destroy Sodom, the *Father of the Faithful* intercedes, with the utmost importunity, for that *idolatrous* as well as incestuous City. The truth is this : The usurped right of punishing for opinions was first assumed and long ingrossed by Idolaters. And, if tradition may be believed, Abraham himself narrowly escaped the *Fire* for preaching against its Divinity. But this is not all. From his own conduct, and from the conduct of his posterity, he seems to have made one part of that fidelity *in keeping the way of the Lord* (for which he is so nobly distinguished by God himself) to consist in inculcating the divine doctrine of Toleration. When JACOB and his family, without leave-taking, had departed from Laban, Rachel stole away her father's Gods. The old man followed and overtook them ; and complaining of the theft, Jacob frankly answered, *With whomsoever thou findest thy Gods, let him not live*. Now, I would ask, was this condemnation on the offender denounced for *Idolatry*, or for the *Theft ?* The words of the Patriarch, which immediately follow, determine this—*Before our brethren discern thou what is thine, with me, and take it to thee.* Well, Rachel, by a female stratagem, contrived to keep her father's Gods ; for no better purpose, we may be sure, than that for which the good man employed so much pains to recover them. The *theft*, indeed, had it been discovered, would have been *punished by the Judge :* But, as for the *Idolatry*, which, from its nature, could not be long hid, the silence of Scripture shews it to have been *coram non Judice.* And so far was Rachel from being doomed to the fire, that we do not find, even her Gods underwent this punishment.

After the affair of the Shechemites, Jacob, by God's command, goes to Bethel : and there, in pious emulation of his grandfather's *care to keep the way of the Lord*, the text tells us, he commanded *his houshold and all that were with him, to put away the strange Gods from amongst them.* They obeyed, all was well ; and not a word of *punishing by the Judge.* Indeed, these *Patriarchal Judges* were much better employed, and more suitably to their office, in punishing civil crimes and immoralities, as appears from the adventure of Judah and his daughter in law, Tamar.

MELCHISEDEC's story is a short one ; he is just brought into the scene to *bless* Abraham in his return from conquest. This promises but ill. Had this *King and Priest of Salem* been brought in *cursing*, it had had a better appearance : for, I think, punishment for opinions, which generally ends in a *Fagot*, always begins with a *curse.* But we may be misled perhaps by a wrong translation. The Hebrew word to *bless*, signifies likewise to *curse*, and, under the management of an intolerant Priest, good things easily run into their contraries. What follows, is his taking *Tythes* from Abraham. Nor will this serve our purpose, unless we interpret these *Tythes* into *Fines for nonconformity ;* and then, by the *blessing*, we can easily understand *absolution.* We have seen much stranger things done with the *Hebrew*

Verity. If this be not allowed, I do not see how we can elicit fire and fagot from this adventure; for I think there is no inseparable connexion between *Tythes* and *Persecution*, but in the ideas of a Quaker.—And so much for *king Melchisedec*.

But the learned *Professor*, who has been hardily brought up in the keen Atmosphere of WHOLESOME SEVERITIES, and early taught to distinguish between *de facto* and *de jure*, thought it needless to enquire into *Facts*, when he was secure of the *Right*. And, therefore, only slightly and superciliously asks, "What! was not Abraham, by his very *princely office, to punish Idolatry?* Were not Melchisedec and Job, and all the heads of Tribes, to do the same?" Why, no: and it is well for Religion that they were not. It is for its honour that such a set of persecuting Patriarchs is no where to be found, but in a *poetical Prelection*.

4. For in the last place, let it be observed, that as these Patriarchs *did not de facto* (which appears from their history,) so they *could not de jure* (which appears from the laws of Nature and Nations) *punish Idolatry by the Judge*. Because, as hath been shewn, Idolatry is not amenable to civil Justice, but where it becomes *Crimen læsæ Majestatis*. It could not become the crime of lese-majesty under the Patriarchs, unless they had been GODS as well as KINGS. Indeed, they were as much one as the other. However, it is not pretended that their government, though *Regal*, was *Theocratical* likewise. The Patriarchs, therefore, could not *punish Idolatry by the Judge*.

From the *Examiner*, the Professor (without the least provocation given him) proceeds to the Author of *The Divine Legation;* who, he will shew, is as ignorant, absurd, and mad-brained, as Father Harduin himself.

The Author of *The Divine Legation* had said, that the Writer of the book of Job *observed decorum*, in imitating the manners of the early scene which he had proposed to adorn. To this, the Professor objects,—"I can never bring myself to allow to a SEMI-BARBAROUS POET, writing after the Babylonian Captivity, such a piece of subtilty and refinement."—A mighty piece of refinement truly, for a Writer, who lays his scene in an early age, to paint, the best he could, the manners of that age.—"Besides" (says the *Professor*) "which is the principal point, the style savours wonderfully of Antiquity, and its peculiar character is a certain primitive and noble simplicity. So that they who degrade this Book to the times posterior to the Babylonian Captivity, seem to judge almost as insanely of *Hebrew* literature as Father Harduin did of the *Roman*, who ascribed the golden Poems of Virgil, Horace, and the rest, to the iron ages of the Monks."—"Verum Poetæ semibarbaro post Captivitatem scribenti tantam subtilitatem ut concedam, impetrare a me non possum. Porro vero Stylus Poematis, quod vel maximum est, præcipue vetustatem sapit; est ejus peculiaris character ἀρχαϊσμός. Adeo ut qui id infra Captivitatem Babylonicam deprimunt, non multo sanius in *Hebraicis* judicare videantur, quam in *Latinis* Harduinus; qui aurea Virgilii, Horatii, cæterorumque poemata ferreis Monachorum Sæculis adscripsit." *Idem ib.*

The learned *Professor* is a little unlucky in his comparison. The age of

Job, as fixed by him, and the age of the Writer of his history, as fixed by me, run exactly parallel, not with the times of Virgil and Frederic Barbarossa, as he would insinuate, but with those of Ennius and Virgil. Job, the hero of the Poem, lived in an *age* when civil Society was but beginning to shew itself, and what is more, in a *Country* where it never yet was formed: And Ezra (whom I suppose to be the Author of the Poem) was an eminent Citizen in the most perfect civil government in the World, which he was sent home to restore, laden with the literary treasures of the East; treasures that had been long accumulating under the warm influence of a large and powerful Empire. From the second transplantation of the Republic, Science got footing in Judea; and true Religion took deeper root in the hearts of its Inhabitants. Henceforward, we hear no more of their absurd Idolatries. A strict *adherence* to the LAW now as much distinguished them from others, as did the *singularity* of the LAW itself. And a studious cultivation of the LANGUAGE, in which that Law was written, as naturally followed, as it did among the Sarazens, who cultivated the Arabic, on the same principle. And to understand how great this was in both, we need only consider, that each had the same aversion to a translation of their Law into a foreign language. It is true, that in course of time, when the Jewish Policy was abolished, and the Nation was become vagabond upon Earth, while the Arabs, on the contrary, had erected a great Empire, a manifest difference arose between them, as to the cultivation of the two Languages. —Yet for all this, the Professor calls Ezra, a SEMI-BARBARIAN; though we agree that he wrote by the inspiration of the Most High; amidst the last blaze indeed, yet in the full lustre of expiring Prophecy.

But the learned Professor has an internal argument from TASTE,* full as good as the other from *Chronology*. "The book of Job savours of Antiquity, and those who cannot relish it, have as depraved a taste as Father Harduin, who could not distinguish Partridge from Horse-flesh."

The truth is, the Greek and Latin Languages having, for many ages, been the mother-tongues of two of the greatest People upon earth (who had shared between them the Empires of *Eloquence* and of *Arms*) became daily more and more copious by the cultivation of Arts; and less and less pure by the extension of Commerce. In these two languages there yet remains a vast number of writings on all sorts of Subjects. So that modern Critics (in the foremost rank of whom will always stand the incomparable BENTLEY) had by long application to them, through their various and progressive refinements and depravations from age to age, acquired a certain sagacity, in passing a tolerable judgment concerning the time of the Writer, by his style and manner. Now Pedantry, which is the ape of Criticism, would mimic the same talent of discernment, in the narrowest and most barren of all Languages; little subject to change, both from the common genius of the East, and from the peculiar situation of a sequestered People. Of this Language, long since become a dead one, the only remains are in one small Volume; the contents of which, had not Providence been mercifully pleased to secure, while the Tongue was yet living, by a translation

* See what hath been said on this head in the 92nd and 93rd pages of this Volume.

into Greek, the HEBREW VERITY, transmitted to us in the manner it was found in the most ancient MSS, where no vowel-points are used, nor space left to distinguish one word from another, and where a great number of terms occur only once, would at this day be a mere arbitrary CIPHER, which every Rabinical or Cabalistic juggler might make the key of his unrevealed Mysteries.—"Idem accidit etiam Mahometanis" (says Abraham Ekell.) "ante inventa ab Ali Abnaditalebo puncta vocalia: Tanta enim legentium erat dissensio, ut nisi Othomanni coërcita fuisset authoritate, et determinata lectio punctis, quæ Ali excogitaverat, JAM DE ALCORANO ACTUM ESSET." And if this had been the case of the Arabic of the Alcoran, a copious and a living language, what had become of the Hebrew of the Bible? a very narrow and a dead one. Of which an ancient Jewish Grammarian gives this character: "Lingua ista [Arabica] elegans est, et longe lateque scriptis dilatata, et qui eam loquitur nulla dictione deficit: Lingua vero sancta pauca est præ illa, cum illius nihil extet nisi quod in Libris Scripturæ reperitur, *nec suppeditet omnes dictiones loquendi necessarias.*" Yet this is the language whose peculiarities of style and composition, correspondent to every age and time, the *Professor* seems to think, may be as easily distinguished as those of the Greek or Latin Classics. So much for the Author of *The Divine Legation:* and indeed too much, had not Mr. LOCKE's defence been involved in his: that excellent person having declared (speaking of the words of Job, *that Idolatry was an iniquity to be punished by the Judge*) "THIS PLACE ALONE, WERE THERE NO OTHER, is sufficient to confirm their opinion who conclude that book to be writ by a JEW."

From *The Divine Legation*, the learned Professor turns again to the Examiner, who seems to sit heavy on his stomach.—This excellent Writer desired to know of the learned, *Where they could find a civil or religious Constitution out of Judæa, which declared that the children should suffer for the crime of their Parents.* To which the Professor replies in these very words—"In præsens Horatiano illo versiculo contentus abito Examinatorum omnium CANDIDISSIMUS"—*For the present, let this* MOST CANDID *of all Examiners go about his business, and be thankful for this scrap of Horace,*

> "Delicta majorum immeritus lues,
> Romane."

This is true Poetical payment: He is called upon for his reckoning, and he discharges it with an old Song. But the Examiner is not a man to take rhime for reason. He asked for an *old system of Laws;* and the contemptuous Professor gives him *an old Ballad:* But a little more civility at parting had not been amiss; for he, who did not spare the Bishop, would certainly demolish the Professor, should he take it into his head to examine the *Prælections* as he hath done the *Sermons.*

NOTES

ON

THE SIXTH BOOK.

P. 73. A. To give an example only in Bishop BULL, whose words, in a *Latin* tract, for a future state's not being in the Mosaic Dispensation, I have quoted in the fourth section of this VIth book; yet in an *English* posthumous sermon, he seems to speak in a very different manner.—I should not have illustrated this censure by the example of so respectable a Person, but for the indiscretion of my Answerers, who, to support their own *ill logic*, have exposed his *morals*.

P. 78. B. Job's *Life*, by means of the Devil and his false Friends, was an exercise of his Patience; and his *History*, by means of Criticism and his Commentators, has since been an exercise of ours. I am far from thinking myself unconcerned in this mischief; for by a foolish attempt to support his Name and Character, I have been the occasion of bringing down whole bands of hostile Critics upon him, who, like the *Sabeans* and *Chaldeans* of old, soon reduced him back to his Dunghill. Some came armed in Latin, some in English, and some in the language of Billingsgate. Most of them were professedly written against me; but all, in reality, bear hardest on the good old Patriarch.

However, though I am, as I said, to be reckoned, along with these, amongst Job's Persecutors; yet I have this to say for myself, that the vexation I gave him was soon over. If I scribbled ten pages on his back, my Adversaries and his have *made long furrows* and scribbled ten thousand. Now, though amongst all these Job found no favour, yet by ill-hap my System did: But to whom I am most obliged, whether to those who attacked it, or to those who espoused it, is not easy to say: for, by a singular event, the Assailants have left me in possession of all its supports, and the Defenders have taken them all away: * the better, I presume, to fit it to their own use. Learned Naturalists tell us of a certain Animal in the watery waste, which, for I know not what conceit, they call *Bernard the Hermit;* and which, in courtesy, they rank with the testaceous tribe, though Nature (so bountiful to the rest of its kind) hath given This no habitation of its own, but sent it naked and unhoused into the world. In recompence, she has enabled it to figure amongst the best of its tribe: for, by a noble endowment of instinct, it is taught to make its way into the best accommodated, and best ornamented shells of its brethren; which it either finds empty, or soon makes so, to fit them up for its own ease and convenience.

P. 78. C. But if the reader would see the absurdity of supposing the book of Job to be written thus early, and at the same time, to teach the resurrection and a future state, exposed at large, he may read the third

* See Mr. G.'s "Discourses on the Book of Job."

chapter of *The free and candid examination of the* BISHOP *of London's Principles.*

P. 79. D. Calmet makes the following observation, in his comment on the 1st verse of chap. xxxviii. "L'Ecrivain de cet Ouvrage a observé de ne point employer ce nom de *Jehovah* dans les discours directs, qu'il fait tenir à Job et à ses Amis: mais dans les recits, qui sont au commencement et à la fin du Livre, il use de ce terme, comme font d'ordinaire les Ecrivains Hebreux. Ce qui *demontre* que l'Ouvrage a été ecrit par un Juif, et depuis Moyse; puisque ce nom incommunicable ne fut connu que depuis l'apparition du Buisson ardent."

P. 81. E. The Cornish Critic thinks otherwise. "These false friends" (says he) "are described as having so much fellow-feeling of Job's sufferings, that they sit with him seven days and nights upon the ground without being able to speak to him. If this be the dramatic way of representing false friends, how shall we know the false from the true?" p. 19. Sempronius, in the Play of Cato, is all along warmer than even Cato himself in the cause of liberty and Rome. *If this be the dramatic way of representing a false patriot* (may our Critic say) *how shall we know the false from the true?* I answer, by observing him with his mask off. And do not Job's false friends unmask themselves, when they so cruelly load their suffering Acquaintance with the most injurious reflections? Indeed the Critic deserves our pity, who cannot see that the formal circumstance of *sitting silent seven days* was a dramatic embellishment in the Eastern manner: The not knowing that the number *seven* was a sacred number amongst the Jews, may indeed be more excusable.—But he goes on. "I have been often struck with surprise to see him [the author of the "Divine Legation"] very earnestly endeavouring to support his allegorical interpretation of the book of Job by arguments drawn from the contradictions, which he fancies he has there espied, to the truth of the history or tradition upon which his allegory is built. Than which, in my apprehension, there can scarce be a greater absurdity. I would desire him to consider attentively the allegorical ode in Horace, *O navis, referent*, &c. that though every thing therein may be accommodated to a republic, yet it is true in the literal or primary sense only of a ship, and that there is not one single stroke in it that can be understood of a republic and not of a ship; and this might shew him his mistake in applying passages in the book of Job to the Jewish People, MERELY because they cannot be understood of Job: which is directly annihilating the allegory he would establish. For it is as plain that in an allegory two things or persons *must be concerned*, as that two and two must go to make four." pp. 99, 100.—The insolence, the fraud, the nonsense of this passage is as much without example as it was without provocation.—I desire to understand, by what other means, except by revelation, an *allegorical* writing can be known to be *allegorical*, but by circumstances in it which cannot be reconciled to the story or fable which serves both for a cover and vehicle to the moral? And yet this man tells us that to attempt to prove the nature of a writing to be allegorical from this circumstance is one of the *greatest absurdities*. When the allegory is of some length, and takes in the life and adventures of a certain person, it can scarce be otherwise but that some circumstances in it must be varied from the fact, to adapt it to the moral. In a shorter, where the object is more simple, there may be no need for any variation. And this shews the disingenuity of this man, in bringing the ode of Horace into comparison. For which too, the little he knows, he is indebted to the author of the Divine Legation. And how little that is we shall now see.

In the first place, I have shewn this Ode not to be of the nature of an *allegory*, where the story is only the cover and vehicle to the moral: but of the nature of a relation containing a *double sense*, primarily and secondarily: in which an information is conveyed in both senses: consequently there ought not to be a *single stroke in it that can be understood of a republic and not of a ship:* But this is a species of writing entirely distinct from the allegory in question; so that the urging it was impertinent: and the following observation is made with his usual insolence:—*this might shew him his mistake in applying passages of the book of Job to the Jewish People* MERELY *because they cannot be understood of Job!* but not with insolence only, but with fraud: For I do not apply passages in the book of Job, MERELY for this reason; no nor principally; but only as one of many reasons.

However, contending for such discordant circumstances in the vehicle-story, he says, *is directly annihilating the allegory.* Now I understood it was the establishing it; as it is the only means of getting to the knowledge of its being an allegory. He goes on,—*For it is as plain that in an allegory two things or persons must be concerned, as that two and two must go to make four.* What he means by this jargon of *two's being concerned*, I know not. If he means that the *fable* and the *moral* must go to the making up the *allegory*, nobody will dispute it with him. But if he means, that all the personages in the *fable* must have all the qualities, attributes, and adventures of the personages in the *moral*, all Æsop's fables will confute this profound reasoner on allegories. However, something, to be sure, he did mean: He had a notion, I suppose, that there was a right and wrong in every thing: he only wanted to know where they lie: Therefore, to make these cursory notes as useful as I can, I will endeavour to explain his meaning. It is certain then, that though the justice of allegoric writing does not require that the facts in the fable do in reality correspond exactly with the facts in the moral, yet the truth of things requires the *possibility* of their so corresponding. Thus, though the Ass perhaps never actually covered himself with a Lion's skin, and was betrayed by his long ears, as Æsop relates; yet we have an example before us, sufficient to convince us that he might have done so, without much expence of instinct. But when *Dryden* made his *Hind and Panther* dispute about the doctrine and discipline of particular Churches; as they never possibly could have done so, *this* (to take his own words, instead of better) *is directly annihilating the allegory he would establish; for it is as plain that in an allegory two things or persons must be concerned, as that two and two must go to make four.* But I fancy I ascribe more to his sagacity than it deserves, in supposing, that he understood, what kind of allegory the book of Job must needs be, if it be any allegory at all. I now begin to suspect he took it to be of the same kind with the Ode of Horace, not indeed because he compares it to that Ode; for such kind of Writers are accustomed to make, as the Poet says, *comparisons unlike;* but because this suspicion may give some light to his cloudy observation, *that two things or persons must be concerned:* For in that sort of allegory, which is of the nature of a relation containing a *double sense* primarily and secondarily, every thing said must agree exactly both to the primary and to the secondary subject. Which perhaps is what this man means by his clumsy precept, of *two things or persons concerned.* The reason of this distinction, in these two sorts of allegory, is this,—In that sort of allegory, which is of the nature of the book of Job, or of the APOLOGUE, the cover *has no moral import:* But in that sort which is of the nature of a NARRATIVE WITH A DOUBLE SENSE, the cover *has a moral import.*

P. 82. F. To this, the Cornish Critic—"What a happy way is here of reconciling contradictions! It seems truth may become falshood, if it be necessary to support the allegory. The moral and the fable may disagree as widely as you please, and the conclusion by a new sort of logic have something in it very different from the premisses." p. 19.—If his kind Reader knows what to make of this jargon of *truth becoming falshood*, and *the conclusion having more in it than the premisses*, he may take it for his pains. All that the Author of the Divine Legation asserts to be here done, and which may be done according to nature and good sense, is no more than this, that a dramatic Writer, when he fetches his subject from History, may alter certain of the circumstances, to fit it to his Plot; which all dramatic Writers, antient and modern, have done. Much more reasonable is this liberty, where the work is not only *dramatic* but *allegorical*. Now I will suppose, that, together with Job's patience under the hand of God, tradition had brought down an account of his further sufferings under the uncharitable censure of three friends: Was not the Maker of this allegoric work at liberty, for the better carrying on his purpose, to represent them as *false* ones. Yet, this liberty, our wonderful Critic calls *reconciling contradictions, making truth become falshood*, and I can't tell what nonsense besides of *premisses and conclusions*.

P. 82. G. *Maimonides* having given a summary of the dispute, draws this inference from it: *Vide et perpende, quâ ratione hoc negotium confusos reddiderit homines, et ad sententias illas de providentiâ Dei erga creaturas quas exposuimus permoverit*. Yet, when he comes to speak of the solution of these difficulties, he could find none. But not to say nothing (the thing most dreaded by Commentators) he pretends to discover, from the obscurity in which things are left, the true scope of the book of Job: *Hic fuit scopus totius libri Jobi, ut scilicet constituatur hic articulus fidei, et doceatur, à rebus naturalibus discendum esse, ut non erremus, aut cogitemus scientiam ejus* [Dei sc.] *ita se habere ut scientiam nostram; intentionem, providentiam, et gubernationem ejus, sicut intentionem, providentiam, et gubernationem nostram.* Mor. Nev. p. 3. c. xxiii.

P. 82. H. Here Dr. Grey exclaims—"How, Sir, *no wiser?* Is God introduced to *unfold* the mysterious ways of his Providence, and yet the knot is left untied, because the Writer, though speaking in the person of God, and by his inspiration, was not *wise enough* to untie it? Is that a speech to the purpose, which in a Controversy, as you will have it, where the disputants have much perplexed the question, and a superior Wisdom *was wanted to determine it*, clears up no difficulties? Or is it language fit to be made use of, when speaking of a book dictated by the Spirit of God, that the writer of it has recourse to the common expedient of dramatic writers to help him out of his straits?" *Answer to Remarks*, p. 125. Softly, good Doctor! In determining a dispute concerning the ways of Providence, though God himself had indeed interposed, we can conceive but two ways of doing it: The one to SATISFY us, by explaining the end and means of that Providence, where the explanation is useful to us, and adequate to our capacities: The other, to SILENCE us, by an argument to our modesty, drawn from the incomprehensible nature and government of the Deity, where an explanation is not useful to us, and inadequate to our capacities. Both these Determinations, the one by *explanation*, the other by *authority*, attended by their respective circumstances, are equally reasonable: and the last is here employed for the reason hinted at, to put an end to this embarrassed dispute. Let this serve in answer to the Doctor's question, *Is that a speech to the purpose, which in a controversy where the*

disputants have much perplexed the question, and a superior wisdom was wanted to determine it, clears up no difficulties?

Indeed, though there was no *untying the knot*, there was a way to *cut it*, which would have done full as well; and that was by revealing the doctrine of a future state. Why it was not done, I leave the learned Critic and all in his sentiments, to give us some good account, since they are not disposed to receive that which the author of the Divine Legation has given. For this Doctor tells us, *it is but small comfort that arises from resolving all into submission to the almighty power of God.* p. 107. St. Paul indeed tells us, it is the greatest *comfort*, as well as wisdom, *to resolve all into submission to the almighty power of God.*—But Doctors differ.

From the MATTER of the D. L. the Doctor proceeds (as we see) to the LANGUAGE.—*Is it language fit to be made use of when speaking of a book dictated by the spirit of God?*—The language hinted at, I suppose, is what he had quoted above, that *the sacred writer was no wiser when he spoke poetically in the person of God*, &c. I think it *not unfit*, and for these reasons; a Prophet speaking or writing by inspiration is just so far and no further enlightened than suits the purpose of his Mission. Now the clearing up the mysterious ways of Providence being reserved amongst the arcana of the Deity, a Prophet (though employed to end the foolish and hurtful disputes about it, amongst men, by an appeal to the incomprehensible nature of the Deity) was certainly, when he made this appeal *in the person of God, no wiser* in the knowledge of this arcanum, *than when he spoke in the person of Job or his friends.*

P. 83. I. This Writer endeavouring to prove the high age of *Job* or of the *Book of Job*, for these two things, after better reasoners, he all along confounds, closes his arguments in this manner, *Denique post formatam rempublicam Judaicam, secretamque à cæteris gentibus, per instituta propria et legem à Deo datam: non facile, credo, hanc sanctam gentem, ejusdem temporis et sæculi alienigenam, vel hominem Gentilem, in exemplum pietatis propositurum, aut ipsius acta et historiam in sacros eorum codices relaturam.* Archæol. Philos. p. 266. ed. 8vo, 1728. The Reader sees, all the strength of the argument rests on this false supposition, that the book must needs be as old as its subject. For if Job were of the Patriarchal times, he was a fit example of piety, let his history be written when it would: and, if written by a sacred Author, it was worthy to be inserted into the Canon of Scripture: and was likely to be so inserted, if composed (as we shall see it was) by a Jewish Prophet.

P. 84. K. Vell. Paterc. Hist. l. i. c. 3. Had Dr. R. Grey known but just so much of the nature of these Compositions, he had never fallen into the ridiculous mistake I am going to take notice of. This learned Critic, to confute the system I advance, that the subject of the argumentative part of the book of Job was, *Whether, and why, the good are sometimes unhappy and the bad prosperous;* and that the question was debated for the sake of the Israelites in the time of Ezra; observes as follows. "Zopher says, c. xx. 4, 5. *Knowest thou not this of old, since man was placed upon earth, that the triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment?* Now lay your hand upon your heart, Sir, and ask yourself seriously, whether this can relate to an extraordinary Providence over the Jews only." p. 111. He is so pleased with the force of this observation that he repeats it, p. 116. To which I need only reply, Lay your hand, Sir, on your head, and reflect upon this rule of good writing, *Nihil enim ex Persona Poetæ, sed omnia sub eorum, qui illo tempore vixerunt, dixerunt.*

P. 84. L. From amongst many instances which might be given of these

slips, take the following of Euripides, in his *Iphigenia in Aulis*, Act. 3. where he makes the Chorus say, *Troy perishes. And for whom? For you, cruel Helen, who, as they say, are the daughter of Jupiter, who, under the form of a Swan, had commerce with Leda.*—So far is well: because we may suppose the Chorus alluded to the popular tale concerning Helen's birth, spread abroad in her life-time. But when the Chorus goes on and says,—*If at least the writings of the Poets be not fabulous*, the Author had forgot himself; for the Poets who embellished her story, lived long afterwards.

P. 85. M. Here the Cornish answerer affirms, "that this method of punishment was not peculiar to the Jewish Polity, but was observed, *in some degrees at least*, with respect to all mankind." For which he quotes Isaiah's threatenings on the Children of the king of Babylon, chap. xiv. 20, et seq. That is, in order to prove that God *punished the crimes of the fathers on the children in some degree at least, with respect to all mankind*, he quotes an instance, not of the *general* providence of God to all mankind, but a *particular* dispensation to the Babylonians: and not a *particular* punishment, which selects out the children of transgressing parents, but a *general* one, which in the nature of things necessarily attends the total overthrow of a State or Community.

P. 85. N. Mr. Locke thought this so decisive a proof that the book of Job was written after the giving of the Law, that he says, This place alone, were there no other, *is sufficient to confirm their opinion who conclude that book to be writ by a Jew.—Third Letter for Toleration*, p. 81, 82. Let those Critics reflect upon this, who think there is no footstep nor shadow of allusion to any thing relating to the people of Israel.

P. 87. O. Ver. 21. evidently taken from these words of the Psalmist, *Thou shalt keep them secretly in a pavilion from the strife of tongues*, Ps. xxxi. 20. For which was the copy and which the original can here admit no doubt, since the image was an obvious one in the Psalmist, who lived in a great city, less natural in Job who lived in a desert, as we have observed above.

P. 93. P. The best and ablest Critics are generally agreed, and have as generally taken it for granted, that this *question* is the subject of debate between the several disputants in the book of Job. It would be abusing the reader's patience to produce a long train of Authorities. Though it may not be improper to give the sentiments of the last, though not the least able of them, on this head.—"Operæ pretium est admonere te, amice Lector, quid nobis de tota hujus Libri materia cogitandum esse videatur. Primum quidem amici Job sic statuunt, quandoquidem tot tantisque cladibus Deus amicum ipsorum Job afflixit, ei Deum esse iratum; eum igitur pœnas tales aliquo scelere, vel aperto, vel occulto commeruisse. Cujus suæ sententiæ testes adhibent generationes hominum priores, in quibus inauditum est, inquiunt, *Deum vel integros viros aspernatum, vel impios manu apprehendisse.* Si quis nostræ ætatis homo sic disputaret, nemo esset quin ejus temeritatem atque audaciam miraretur, qui rem aperte falsam sumeret, cum sæpissimè eveniat et summas miserias experiri hac in mortali vita viros bonos, et florentissimam fortunam; flagitiosos. Tamen Job, *id quod est maxime considerandum*, redargutione tali non utitur. Non id negat, quod sui amici, Patrum memoria teste confirmabant; quod tamen Job, si falsum id sibi videretur, uno verbo, *Mentiris*, poterat confutare. Atque etiam idem Job alterum negans, tales se miserias crimine aliquo suo fuisse commeritum, alterum tamen non dissimulat, Deum sibi adversari; in qua ipsa sancti viri confessione adversariorum causa ex parte vincebat, cum suas clades Job sic acciperet, ut iræ divinæ consueta signa, cumque inde non parum animo æstuaret. Quæ cum ita sint, nos sic existimamus, non falsos

fuisse memoriæ testes Job amicos ; atque adeo, PRIMIS MUNDI TEMPORIBUS, homines impios fuisse, præter solitum naturæ cursum, divinâ irâ percussos, iisque acceptos plagis, quarum sancti homines essent immunes ; Deo Opt. Max. humanas res ita moderante, ut Religionem in terris tueretur, et ut homines, cum talia exempla paterentur, cogitarent esse in cœlo Deum justum, a quo mortales ut recte factorum præmium sperare deberent, sic scelerum ultionem timere." HOUBIGANT *in librum Job, lectori.*

But, since the writing of my Dissertation, the language of the rabbinical men has been greatly changed. And, partly to keep up the antiquity of the book, but principally to guard against an *extraordinary Providence*, several of them, in defiance of their senses, have denied that this, which this honest Priest of the Oratory makes to be the subject of the book of Job, has indeed any thing at all to do with it. Amongst the foremost of these is Dr. Richard Grey, the epitomiser of Albert Schultens' Comment on this book. In the preface to his Abstract, amongst other things, he has criticised my opinion of the scope of the book in the following manner.—"Nam quod dicit vir clariss. id præcipue in hoc libro disceptari, nempe an bonis semper bona, malisque mala, an utrisque utraque promiscue obtingent ; hanc autem quæstionem (a nobis quidem alienam, minus ideo perpensam) nusquam alibi gentium præterquam in Judæa nec apud ipsos Judæos alio quovis tempore, quam quod assignat, moveri potuisse, id omne ex veritate suæ hypotheseos pendet, et mea quidem sententia, longe aliter se habet." Præf. p. 10—15. *For as to what this writer* [the author of the D. L.] *says, that the main question handled in the book of Job is whether good happens to the good, and evil to evil men, or whether both happen not promiscuously to both ; and that this question (a very foreign one to us, and therefore the less attended to) could never be the subject of disputation any where but in the land of Judæa, nor there neither at any other time than that which he assigns ; all this, I say, depends on the truth of his hypothesis, and is, in my opinion, far otherwise.*—That which *depends on the truth of an hypothesis* has, indeed, generally speaking, a very slender foundation: and I am partly of opinion it was the common prejudice against this support which disposed the learned Prefacer to give my notions no better a name. But what I have shewn to be the subject of the book is so far from depending on the truth of my hypothesis, that the truth of my hypothesis depends on what I have shewn to be the subject of the book: and very fitly so, as every reasonable *hypothesis* should be supported on a *fact*. Now I might appeal to the learned world, whether it be not as clear a fact that the subject of the book of Job is *whether good happens to the good, and evil to evil men, or whether both happen not promiscuously to both ;* as that the subject of the first book of *Tusculan Disputations* is *de contemnenda morte.* On this I founded my hypothesis, that the book of Job must have been written about the time of Esdras, because no other assignable time could at all suit the subject.—But 'tis possible I may mistake in what he calls *my hypothesis :* for aught I know, he may understand not that of the book of Job, but that of the *Divine Legation.* And then, by *my hypothesis*, he must mean the great religious principle I endeavoured to evince, THAT THE JEWS WERE IN REALITY UNDER AN EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE. But it will be paying me a very unusual compliment to call that my hypothesis which the Bible was not only divinely written, but was likewise divinely preserved, to testify ; which all Believers profess to believe ; and which none but Unbelievers and *Answerers* to the Divine Legation directly deny. However, if this be the *hypothesis* he means, I need desire no better a support. But the truth is, my interpretation of the book of Job seeks

support from nothing but those common rules of grammar and logic on which the sense of all kind of writings are or ought to be interpreted.

He goes on in this manner. "Nempe id unum voluisse mihi videtur sacer Scriptor, ut iis omnibus, utcunque afflictis, humilitatis et patientiæ perpetuum extaret documentum ex contemplatione gemina, hinc infinitæ Dei perfectionis, sapientiæ et potentiæ ; illinc humanæ, quæ in sanctissimis quoque viris inest, corruptionis, imbecillitatis et ignorantiæ." *For the* SOLE *purpose of the sacred writer seems to me to be this, to compose a work that should remain a perpetual document of humility and patience to all good men in affliction from this two-fold consideration, as on the one hand of the infinite perfection, power, and wisdom of God ; so on the other, of human corruption, imbecillity, and ignorance, discoverable even in the best of men.* Such talk in a popular discourse, for the sake of a moral application, might not be amiss : but to speak thus to the learned world, is surely out of season. The Critic will be apt to tell him, he hath mistaken the *Actor for the subject ;* and that he might on the same principle as well conclude that the purpose of Virgil's poem is not the establishment of an empire in Italy, but the personal piety of Æneas. But to be a little more explicit. The book of Job consists of two distinct parts ; the *narrative,* contained in the prologue and epilogue ; and the *argumentative,* which composes the body of the work. Now when the question is of the subject of a book, who means any other than the body of it? yet the learned Doctor mistaking the *narrative* part for the *argumentative,* gives us the subject of the introduction and conclusion for that of the work itself. And it is very true that the beginning and the end do exhibit *a perpetual document of humility and patience to all good men in affliction.* But it is as true that the body of the work neither does nor could exhibit any such document. First it doth not ; for, that humility and patience, which Job manifests before his entering into dispute, is succeeded by rage and ostentation when he becomes heated with unreasonable opposition. Secondly, it could not ; because it is altogether argumentative ; the subject of which must needs be a proposition debated, and not a document exemplified. A precept may be conveyed in history ; but a disputation can exhibit only a debated question. I have shewn what that question is ; and he, instead of proving that I have assigned a wrong one, goes about to persuade the reader, that there is no question at all.

He proceeds. "Quamvis enim in sermonibus, qui in eo habentur, de religione, de virtute, de providentia, Deique in mundo gubernando sapientia, justitia, sanctitate, de uno rerum omnium principio, aliisque gravissimis veritatibus dissertetur, hunc tamen quem dixi unicum esse libri scopum, tam ex initio et fine, quam ex universâ ejus œconomiâ cuivis opinor manifestum erit. Ea enim, ut rem omnem summatim complectar, Jobum exhibet, primo quidem querentem, expostulantem, effræno luctui indulgentem ; mox (quum, ut sacri dramatis natura postulabat, amicorum contradictione, sinistrisque suspicionibus magis magisque irritatus et lacessitus esset) imprudentius Deum provocantem, atque in justitia sua gloriantem ; ad debitam tandem summissionem suique cognitionem revocatum, tum demum, nec antea, integritatis suæ tam præmium, quam testimonium a Deo reportantem." *For although in the speeches that occur, there be much talk of religion, virtue, and providence, of God's wisdom, justice, and holiness in the government of the world, of one principle of all things, and other most important truths, yet that this which I have assigned is the only scope of the book will appear manifest to every one, as well from the beginning and the end as from the œconomy of the whole. For to say all in a word, it first presents*

Job complaining, expostulating, and indulging himself in an ungovernable grief: but soon after (when, as the nature of the sacred drama required, by the contradiction of his friends, and their sinister suspicions, he became more and more teized and irritated) rashly challenging God, and glorying in his own integrity; yet at length brought back to a due submission and knowledge of himself. The reader sees that all this is just as pertinent as if I should say, Mr. CHILLINGWORTH's famous book against Knot the Jesuit, was not to prove *the religion of Protestants a safe way to salvation*, but to give the picture of an artful Caviller and a candid Disputer. "For, although, in the arguments that occur, there be much talk of protestantism, popery, infallibility, a judge of controversies, fundamentals of faith, and other most important matters, yet that this which I have assigned is the only scope of the book, will appear manifest to every one, as well from the beginning and the end, as from the œconomy of the whole. For it first of all presents the sophist quibbling, chicaning, and indulging himself in all the imaginable methods of false reasoning: and soon after, as the course of disputation required, resting on his own authority, and loading his adversary with personal calumnies; yet at length, by the force of truth and good logic, brought back to the point; confuted, exposed, and put to silence." Now if I should say this of the book of Chillingworth, would it not be as true, and as much to the purpose, as what our author hath said of the book of Job? The matters in the discourse of *the Religion of Protestants* could not be treated as they are without exhibiting the two characters of a Sophist and a true Logician. Nor could the matters in the book of Job be treated as they are without exhibiting a good man in afflictions, complaining and expostulating; impatient under the contradiction of his friends, yet at length brought back to a due submission, and knowledge of himself. But therefore, to make this the *sole* or *chief Scope* of the book, (for in this he varies) is perverting all the rules of interpretation. But what misled him we have taken notice of above. And he himself points to it, where he says,—*the subject I have assigned to the book of Job appears the true both from the* BEGINNING *and the* END. It is true, he adds, and *from the œconomy of the whole* likewise.

Which he endeavours to prove in this manner: *For it first presents Job complaining, expostulating, and indulging himself in an ungovernable grief: but soon after (when, as the nature of the sacred drama required, by the contradiction of his friends, and their sinister suspicions, he became more and more teized and irritated) rashly challenging God, and glorying in his own integrity: yet at length brought back to a due submission and knowledge of himself; and then at last, and not before, receiving from God both the reward and testimony of his uprightness.* This is indeed a fair account of the CONDUCT of the drama. And from this it appears, first, that that which he assigns for the SOLE SCOPE of the book cannot be the true. For if its design were to give *a perpetual document of humility and patience*, how comes it to pass, that the author, in the execution of this design, represents *Job complaining, expostulating, and indulging himself in an ungovernable grief, rashly challenging God, and glorying in his own integrity?* Could a painter, think you, in order to represent the ease and safety of navigation, draw a vessel getting with much pains and difficulty into harbour, after having lost all her lading and been miserably torn and shattered by a tempest? and yet you think a writer, in order to give a *document of humility and patience*, had sufficiently discharged his plan, if he made Job conclude *resigned and submissive*, though he had drawn him turbulent, impatient, and almost blasphemous throughout the whole piece. Secondly,

it appears from the learned Author's account of the *conduct* of the drama, that that which I have assigned for the *sole Scope* of the book is the true. For if, in Job's distressful circumstances, the question concerning an equal or unequal providence were to be debated: His friends, if they held the former part, must needs doubt of his integrity: this doubt would naturally provoke Job's indignation; and, when it was persisted in, cause him to fly out into the intemperate excesses so well described by the learned Doctor: yet conscious innocence would at length enable patience to do its office, and the conclusive argument for his integrity would be his resignation and submission.

The learned Writer sums up the argument thus. "Ex his inquam apparet, non primario agi in hoc libro de providentia, sive æquali, sive inæquali, sed de personali Jobi integritate." *From all this, I say, it appears, that the personal integrity of Job, and not the question concerning an equal or unequal Providence, is the principal subject of the book.* He had before only told us his *opinion;* and now, from his opinion, he says it *appears.* But the appearances, we see, are deceitful; and so they will always be, when they arise only out of the fancy or inclination of the Critic, and not from the nature of things.

But he proceeds. "Hanc enim (quod omnino observandum est) in dubium vocaverant amici, non ideo tantum quod afflictus esset, sed quod afflictus impatientius se gereret, Deique justitiæ obmurmuraret: et qui strenuus videlicet aliorum hortator fuerat ad fortitudinem et constantiam, quum ipse tentaretur, victus labasceret." *For that* [i. e. his personal integrity] *it was which his friends doubted of, not so much on account of his affliction, as for the not bearing his affliction with patience, but murmuring at the justice of God. And that he who was a strenuous adviser of others to fortitude and constancy, should, when his own trial came, sink under the stroke of his disasters.*—But why not *on account of his afflictions?* Do not we find that even now, under this unequal distribution of things, censorious men (and such doubtless he will confess Job's comforters to have been) are but too apt to suspect great afflictions for the punishment of secret sins. How much more prone to the same suspicion would such men be in the time of Job, when the ways of Providence were more equal? As to his *impatience in bearing affliction*, that symptom was altogether ambiguous, and might as likely denote want of fortitude as want of innocence; and proceed as well from the pain of an ulcerated body, as the anguish of a distracted conscience.

Well, our Author has brought the Patriarch thus far on his way, to expose his *bad temper.* From hence he accompanies him to his place of rest; which, as many an innocent man's is, he makes to be in a *bad argument.* "Quum accesserat sanctissimi viri malis, hæc gravissima omnium tentatio, ut tanquam improbus et hypocrita ab amicis damnaretur, et quod unicum ei supererat, conscientiæ suæ testimonio ac solatio, quantum ipsi potuerunt, privandus foret, quid misero faciendum erat? Amicos perfidiæ et crudelitatis arguit: Deum integritatis suæ testem vindicemque appellat: quum autem nec Deus interveniret, ad innocentiam ejus vindicandam, nec remitterent quicquam amici de acerbis suis censuris, injustisque criminationibus, ad SUPREMUM ILLUD JUDICIUM provocat, in quo REDEMPTOREM sibi affuturum, Deumque a suis partibus staturum, summa cum fiducia se novisse affirmat." *Now when* (says the learned Writer) *the most grievous trial of all was added to the other evils of this holy person; to be condemned by his friends as a profligate, and an hypocrite, and to be deprived, as much as in them lay, of his only remaining support, the Testimony of a good con-*

science, What was left for the unhappy man to do? He accuses his friends of perfidy and cruelty; he calls upon God as the witness and avenger of his integrity: But when neither God interposed to vindicate his innocence, nor his friends forbore to urge their harsh censures and unjust accusations, he appeals to that LAST JUDGMENT, *in which with the utmost confidence he affirms that he knew that his* REDEEMER *would be present to him, and that God would declare in his favour.* To understand the force of this representation, we must have in mind this unquestionable truth; "That, be the subject of the book what it will, yet if the sacred Writer bring in the persons of the drama disputing, he will take care that they talk with *decorum* and to the purpose." Now we both agree that Job's friends had pretended at least to suspect his integrity. This suspicion it was Job's business to remove; and, if the Doctor's account of the subject be right, his only business. To this end he offers various arguments, which failing of their effect, he at last (as the Doctor will have it) appeals to the SECOND COMING OF THE REDEEMER OF MANKIND. But was this likely to satisfy them? They demand a present solution of their doubts, and he sends them to a future judgment. Nor can our Author say (though he would insinuate) that this was such a sort of appeal as disputants are sometimes forced to have recourse to, when they are run aground and have nothing more to offer: For Job, after this, proceeds in the dispute; and urges many other arguments with the utmost propriety. Indeed there is one way, and but one, to make the appeal pertinent: and that is, to suppose our Author mistaken, when he said that the *personal integrity of Job, and not the question concerning an equal or unequal Providence, was the main subject of the book:* And we may venture to suppose so, without much danger of doing him wrong: for, the doctrine of a *future judgement* affords a principle whereon to determine the *question of an equal or unequal Providence;* but it leaves the *personal integrity of Job* just as it found it. But the learned Author is so little solicitous for the *pertinency* of the argument, that he makes, as we shall now see, its *impertinence* to be one of the great supports of his system. For thus he concludes his argument. "Jam vero si cardo controversiæ fuisset, utrum, salva Dei justitia, sancti in hac vita, adfligi possent, hæc ipsa declaratio litem finire debuerat. Sin autem de personali Jobi innocentia disceptetur, nil mirum quod veterem canere cantilenam, Jobumque ut fecerant, condemnare pergerent socii, quum Dei solius erat, qui corda hominum explorat, pro certo scire, an jure merito sibi Jobus hoc solamen attribueret, an falsam sibi fiduciam vanus arrogaret." *But now if the hinge of the controversy had turned on this, Whether or no, consistently with God's justice, good men could be afflicted in this life, this declaration ought to have finished the debate: but if the question were concerning the personal innocence of Job, it was no wonder that they still sung their old song, and went on as they had begun, to condemn their much afflicted friend; since it was in the power of God alone to explore the hearts of men, and to know for certain whether it was Job's piety that rightly applied a consolation, or whether it was his vanity that arrogated a false confidence to himself.* This is a very pleasant way of coming to the sense of a disputed passage: Not, as of old, by shewing it supports the *Writer's argument*, but by shewing it supports the *Critic's hypothesis.* I had taken it for granted that Job reasoned to the purpose, and therefore urged this argument against understanding him as speaking of the *Resurrection* in the xixth chapter. "The disputants" (say I) "are all equally imbarassed in adjusting the ways of Providence. Job affirms that the good man is sometimes unhappy; the three friends pretend that he never can be so; because such a situation would reflect upon God's justice. Now

the doctrine of a *Resurrection* supposed to be urged by Job cleared up all this embarras. If therefore his friends thought it true, it ended the dispute; if false, it lay upon them to confute it. Yet they do neither: They neither call it into question, nor allow it to be decisive. But without the least notice that any such thing had been urged, they go on as they began, to inforce their former arguments, and to confute that which they seem to understand was the only one Job had urged against them; viz. the consciousness of his own innocence."—Now what says our learned Critic to this? Why, he says, that if I be mistaken, and he be right in his account of the book of Job, the reason is plain why the three friends took no notice of Job's appeal to a Resurrection; namely, because it deserved none. As to his being in the right, the reader, I suppose, will not be greatly solicitous, if it be one of the consequences that the sacred Reasoner is in the wrong. However, before we allow him to be right, it will be expected he should answer the following questions. If, as he says, the point in the book of Job was *only his personal innocence*, and this, not (as I say) upon the PRINCIPLE of *no innocent person being miserable;* I would ask how it was possible that Job's friends and intimates should be so obstinately bent on pronouncing him guilty, the purity of whose former life and conversation they were so well acquainted with? If he will say, the disputants went upon that PRINCIPLE, I then ask how came Job's appeal to a Resurrection not to silence his opposers? as it accounted for the justice of God in the present unequal distribution of things.

P. 93. Q. *This is one thing* (says Job) *therefore I said it,* HE DESTROYETH THE PERFECT WITH THE WICKED, chap. ix. 22. as much as to say, this is the point or general question between us, and I stick to the affirmative, and insist upon its truth. The words which follow are remarkable. It had been objected, that when the good man suffered it was for a tryal; to this Job replies: *If the scourge slay suddenly, he will laugh at the trial of the innocent*, ver. 23. *suddenly*, or *indiscriminately*, as Schultens rightly understands it; as much as to say, when the sword devours the innocent and the wicked man without distinction, if the innocent will distinguish his ill hap from the wicked man's, and call it a *tryal*, the wicked man will mock at him; and indeed not without some shew of reason.

P. 93. R. "Supposing" (says the Cornish Answerer) "we should allow such an *equal Providence* to have been administered in *Judæa;* yet, since he himself reckons it the utmost extravagance to suppose it any where else; what an idea does he give us of the talents of *Ezra?* who, according to him, has introduced persons who were no Jews debating a question so palpably absurd as that it NEVER *entered into the head of any one man living to make a question of it out of the land of Judæa?* consequently could not with the least probability or propriety be handled by any but Jews. Is this like one who, he would make us to believe, was *a careful observer of Decorum?* certainly the rule of Decorum would have obliged him 'reddere personæ,' &c. as Horace speaks—either to look out for proper persons to debate his questions, or to fit his question to the persons." I should have reason to complain of this insolence of Language, so habitual to these Answerers, did it not always carry its own punishment along with it. For, look, in proportion to their rudeness, is generally their folly, or ill faith.—*Supposing* (says this man) *we should allow such an equal Providence*, &c.—Now, when the Reader considers I am only contending for the *actual* administration of such a providence as the Bible, in almost every page, represents to have been administered, will he not naturally suppose this to be some infidel-writer making a gracious concession even at the expence of his own cause? But when he

is told that the writer is a minister of the Gospel, will he not conclude that his head is turned with the rage of *Answering?*

He tells his Reader that I say, "That the debated question in the book of Job could NEVER enter into the head of any man living out of the land of Judea." Now, the very words from whence he pretends to deduce this proposition, convict him of imposture.—*This* (say I) *could never have been made matter of dispute* FROM THE MOST EARLY SUPPOSED TIME OF JOB'S EXISTENCE EVEN TO OURS, *in any place out of the land of Judea.* Which surely implies it might have been a question *then;* or why did I restrain the case to the times *since* Job's existence? Was it for nothing? In fact I was well apprised (and saw the advantages I could derive from it) that the question might as reasonably have been debated at the time when Job lived, as at the time when, I supposed, the book of Job was written. But as this was a matter reserved for another place, I contented myself with the hint conveyed in this limitation, which just served to lay in my claim to the use I should hereafter have for it. The truth is, the state of God's providence *in the most early supposed time of Job's existence* is a subject I shall have occasion to consider at large in the last volume of this Work, where I employ it, among other proofs, to illustrate and confirm the conclusion of my general argument by one entire view of the harmony which reigns through all the various parts of the Divine Government as administered over man. Of this my Answerers have no conception. Their talents are only fitted to consider *parts*, and such talents best suit their business, which is, to find fault.—They will say, they were not obliged to wait. But who obliged them to write? And if they should wait longer, they will have no reason to complain: For the cloudy and imperfect conception they have of my argument as it now stands, is the most commodious situation for the carrying on their trade. However, whether they prefer the light of common sense to this darkness occasioned by the absence of it, or the friendly twilight of Polemics to both, I shall not go out of my way to gratify their humour. I have said enough to expose this silly cavil of our Cornish Critic, and to vindicate the knowledge of the writer of the book of Job, and his observance of *decorum*, in opening a beauty in the contrivance of this work, which these Answerers were not aware of.

P. 94. S. *The Use and Intent of Prophecy, &c.* p. 208. 3d edit.—Grotius thinks the book was written for the consolation of the descendants of Esau, carried away in the Babylonish captivity; apparently, as the same writer observes, to avoid the absurdity arising from the supposition confuted above; and yet, as he farther observes, Grotius, in endeavouring to avoid one difficulty, has fallen into another. For, suppose *it writ* (says the Author of The Use and Intent of Prophecy, &c.) *for the children of Esau, they were idolaters; and yet there is no allusion to their idolatry in all this book. And what ground is there to think they were so righteous as to deserve such an interpretation to be put upon their sufferings, as the book of Job puts on them, if so be it was written for their sakes? Or can it be imagined, that a book writ about the time supposed, for the use of an idolatrous nation, and odious to the Jews, could ever have been received into the Jewish canon?* p. 208. These are strong objections, and will oblige us to place this opinion amongst the singularities of the excellent Grotius.

P. 98. T. "Here" (says the Cornish Critic) "take the poem in the other light, as an *allegoric* fiction, and what could it possibly afford besides a very *odd amusement?* for the truth of history is destroyed: and we have nothing in the room of it, but a monstrous jumble of times and persons brought together, that were in reality separated from each other by the

distance of a thousand or twelve hundred years. Had the author been able to produce but one precedent of this sort amongst the writings of the ancients, it might have afforded some countenance to this opinion: but, I believe, it would be difficult to find it." p. 47. What then, I beseech you, becomes of *Solomon's Song*, if you will not allow it to be a *precedent of this sort?* Here, in the opinion of the Church, as appears by the insertion of it into the Canon, or at least in the opinion of such Churchmen as our Critic, Solomon, under the cover of a love-tale, or amorous intrigue between him and an Egyptian lady, has represented Christ's union and marriage with the Church. Surely, the patience or impatience of Job had a nearer relation *in nature* to the patience or impatience of the Jewish People, than Solomon's love intrigue had, *in grace*, to the salvation obtained by Jesus Christ. Yet this we are to deem no odd amusement for the WISE MAN. But for a Prophet, to employ the story of Job, to reprove the errors of the People committed to his care, and to inform them of an approaching change in their Dispensation, is by no means to be endured. What! has this great Critic never heard that, amongst the *writings of the ancients*, there was a certain allegoric piece known by the name of *The Judgment of Hercules*, written by a Grecian SAGE, to excite the youth of his time to the pursuit of virtue, and to withstand the allurements of pleasure? HERCULES was as well known by history and tradition to the Greeks, as JOB was to the Jews. Did that polite people think this an *odd amusement?* Did they think the *truth of History destroyed by it; and nothing left in its room but a monstrous jumble of times and persons, brought together, that were in reality separated from each other by the distance of a thousand or twelve hundred years?* for so many at least there were between the age of Hercules and the young Men of the time of Prodicus. Or does this Cornish Critic imagine, that the Sages of Greece took the Allegory for History: or believed any more of a real rencontre between Virtue, Pleasure, and young Hercules, than Maimonides did of that solemn meeting of the Devil and the Sons of God before the throne of the Almighty?

But that curious remark of *destroying the truth of History* deserves a little further canvassing. I suppose, when Jesus transferred the story of the Prodigal and his sober Brother to the Gentiles and the Jews, and when St. John transferred Babylon to Rome, in allegory, that they *destroyed the truth of History*. When ancient and modern dramatic Writers take their subject from History, and make free with facts to adapt their plot to the nature of their poem, Do they *destroy the truth of History?* Yet in their case there is only one barrier to this imaginary mischief, namely the *Drama:* In the book of Job, there are two, both the *Drama* and the *Allegory*. But after all, some hurt it may do, amongst the Readers of the size of this Answerer, when they mistake the book of Job for a piece of Biography, like the men *Ben Jonson* laughs at, who, for greater exactness, chose to read the History of England in Shakespear's Tragedies.

P. 98. U. But the Cornish Critic, who has no conception that even a patient man may, on some occasions, break out into impatient heats, insists on the *impropriety* of Job's representing the Israelites of Ezra's time. "To represent the murmuring and impatient Jews" (says he) "it seems Ezra takes a person who was exemplary for the contrary quality—and then, to adapt him to his purpose, makes him break out into such excesses of impatience as border on blasphemy." p. 50. I doubt there is a small matter amiss in this fine observation. The Author of *The Divine Legation* did not write the book of Job: therefore whatever discordancy there be between the Tradition of his patience and the written History of him in this book,

it is just the same, whether JOB or whether EZRA wrote it. After so illustrious a specimen of his critical acumen, he may lie in bed, and cry out with the old Athlet,

"Cæstum artemque repono."

However, he meant well, and intended that this supposed absurdity should fall upon the Author of *The Divine Legation*, and not upon the Canon of Scripture. In the mean time the truth is, there is no absurdity at all, but what lies in his own cloudy pericranium. Whether the traditionary Job represented the Israelites or not, it is certain, he might with much decorum represent them. And this the following words of *The Divine Legation* might have taught our Critic, had he had but so much candour as to do justice to a Stranger, whom he would needs make his Enemy.—"It is remarkable, that Job, from the beginning of his misfortunes to the coming of his three comforters, though greatly provoked by his wife, *sinned not with his lips;* but, persecuted by the malice and bitterness of his false friends, he began to lay so much stress on his innocence as even to accuse God of injustice. This was the very state of the Jews of this time; so exactly has the sacred Writer conducted his allegory; They bore their straits and difficulties with temper till their enemies Sanballat, Tobiah, and the Arabians, gave them so much disturbance; and then they fell into indecent murmurs against God." But lest our Answerer should again mistake this, for a defence of the Author of the Divine Legation, and not of Ezra, let him try, if he can reconcile the traditional patience of Job with the several strokes of impatience in the written book, upon any other principle than this, That the most patient man alive may be provoked into starts of impatience, by a miserable Caviler, who, being set upon *Answering* what he does not understand, represents falsely, interprets perversely, and, when he is unable to make the *Doctrine* odious, endeavours to make the *Person* so, who holds it. In conclusion however, thus much is fit to be observed, that if the sole or main intention of the Writer of the book of Job (be he whom he will) were to exhibit an example of Patience, he has executed his design very ill; certainly in so perverse a manner that, from this book, the fame of Job's exemplary Patience could never have arisen. Hence I conclude in favour of an Hypothesis which solves this difficulty, by distinguishing between Job's traditional and written story. But now comes a Cornish Critic, and makes this very *circumstance*, which I urged for the support of my Hypothesis, an objection to it. Yet he had grounds for his observation, such as they were; He dreamt, for he could not be awake, that I had *invented* the *circumstance*, whereas I only *found* it.

P. 104. X. The different situations in which this Folly operated in *ancient* and *modern* times, is very observable. In the simplicity of the early ages, while men were at their ease, that general opinion, so congenial to the human mind, of *a God and his moral government*, was too strong ever to be brought in question. It was when they found themselves miserable and in distress, that they began to complain; to question the justice, or to deny the existence of a Deity: On the contrary, amongst us, disasterous times are the season of reflection, repentance, and reliance on Providence. It is affluence and abundance which now give birth to a wanton sufficiency, never thoroughly gratified till it have thrown off all the restraints of Religion.

I imagine it may not be difficult to account for so strange a contrariety in the manners of Men.

In the ancient World, the belief of a moral Providence was amongst

their most incontested principles. But concerning the nature and extent of this Providence they had indeed very inadequate conceptions; being misled by the *extraordinary* manner in which the first exertions of it were manifested, to expect more instant and immediate protection than the nature of the *Dispensation* afforded. So that these men being, in their own opinion, the most worthy object of Providence's concern, whenever they became pressed by civil or domestic distresses, supposed all to be lost, and the world without a Governor.

But in these modern ages of vice and refinement, when every blessing is abused, and, amongst the first, that greatest of all, LIBERTY, each improvement of the mind, as well as each accommodation of the body, is perverted into a species of *luxury;* exercised and employed for amusement, to gratify the Fancy or the Appetites, as each, in their turn, happens to influence the Will. Hence even the FIRST PHILOSOPHY, the science of Nature itself, bows to this general abuse. It is made to act against its own ordinances, and to support those impieties it was authorised to suppress.—But now, when calamity, distress, and all the evils of those abused blessings have, by their severe but wholesome discipline, restored recollection and vigour to the relaxed and dissipated mind, the dictates of Nature are again attended to: the impious principles of false Science, and the false conclusions of the true, are shaken off as a hideous dream; and the abused Victim of his vanity and his pleasure flies for refuge to that only Asylum of Humanity, RELIGION.

P. 104. Y. Thus both *Sacro* and *Sacer* have, in Latin, contrary significations. The reason is evident. Some things were *consecrated* and some *devoted* to the Gods: those were *holy;* these *execrable.* So God being invoked sometimes to *bless*, and sometimes to *curse*, the invocation was expressed by one word, which had contrary senses. And this agreeable to the genius of language in general.

P. 106. Z. The Cornish Critic says—"Above all, and to support the allegory in its most concerning circumstances, as the Jews were obliged to put away their idolatrous wives, so Job should have put away his, in the upshot of the fable. This would CERTAINLY have been done had such an allegory been intended as Mr. W. supposes." p. 66. Let this man alone for his distributive justice. I thought, when, in the conclusion of the book, we have a detailed account of Job's whole family, his sons, his daughters, and his cattle, and that we hear nothing of his wife (and, I ween, she would have been heard of had she been there), the Writer plainly enough insinuated that Job had somehow or other got rid of this Affliction, with the rest. But nothing else will serve our Righter of wrongs but a formal bill of divorce.—Indeed I suspect, a light expression I chanced to make use of, gave birth to this ingenious objection. See above, p. 104.

P. 114. AA. Divine Wisdom procures many *ends* by one and the same *mean;* so here, besides this use, of throwing the Reader's attention entirely on the *Serpent*, it had another, *viz.* to make the *Serpent*, which was of the most sacred and venerable regard in the Mysterious Religion of Egypt, the object of the Israelites' utter abhorrence and detestation.

P. 120. BB. To this Dr. Grey says, that the three friends likewise accuse Job of his *present* faults. Well, and what then? Does this acquit them of injustice for falsely charging him with *preceding* ones?

P. 123. CC. Indeed, had the book of Job the high antiquity which the common system supposes, the contending at the same time for the *spiritual* sense of this text, would be followed with insuperable difficulties: but these, let the supporters of that System look to. The very learned Author

of *the Argument of the Divine Legation fairly stated, &c.* hath set these difficulties in a light which, I think, shews them to be insuperable: "Those men" (says this excellent writer) "who maintain this system, [of the *high antiquity* of the book, and the *spiritual* sense of the text] must needs regard the text to be *direct and literal*, not *typical or figurative*. But then this difficulty occurs, How came Moses (if he was the Author) to be so clear in the *book of Job*, and so obscure in the *Pentateuch?* Plain expression and typical adumbration are the contrary of one another. They could not *both* be fit for the same people, at the same time. If they were a spiritualized People, they had no need of carnal covers, such as Types; and if they were a carnal-minded people, the light of spiritual things would only serve to dazzle, not to aid their sight.

"Nor is the matter mended, but made worse, by supposing the book to be written by JOB himself, or any other Patriarch earlier than Moses: That would be only transferring the Charge from *Moses*, to the *God of Moses:* For while the *book of Job* was designed by Providence, for part of the *Jewish Canon*, it is the same unaccountable conduct though removed thither. The RESURRECTION is open and exposed to all in the *book of Job;* and it is hid and covered under types and figures in the *Pentateuch*. From whence arises this noble truth worthy of its inventers, *That the same doctrine may, at one and the same time, be the proper object both of clear and manifest, and of dark and uncertain contemplation, to the same Persons.*" p. 134.

P. 126. DD. Here the Cornish Critic observes, "That it does not appear that Job had any particular revelation of it, [i. e. his future felicity]; and therefore his confidence (if he had any such) must proceed upon some such principle as this, That God would at length infallibly deliver the good Man out of trouble. And again, this principle must be founded on that other of an equal Providence: from whence otherwise could it arise but from a persuasion that God will most certainly do what is equal and exact in this life? And yet the ingenious Author, as if fond of reconciling contradictions, makes Job's Thesis to be this, *that Providence is not equally administered*, at the same time, that he ascribes to him a confidence which could NOT POSSIBLY arise but from the persuasion *of an equal Providence.*" p. 156.

I make Job hold *that Providence was not equally administered.* I make him to hold likewise, *that he himself should be restored to his former felicity:* And this, our Critic calls a CONTRADICTION. His reason is, that this latter opinion could arise only from his *persuasion of an equal Providence.* This may be true, if there be no medium between an equal Providence and no Providence at all. But I suspect there is such a medium, from observing that it is not uncommon, even in these times, for good men in affliction, to have this very confidence of Job, without ever dreaming of an *equal Providence.*

The truth is (and so I have said in the words which gave occasion to this notable observation) that Job had through the distemperature of passion advanced some things which on cooler thoughts he retracted. His argument against an *equal Providence* was sometimes pushed so far as to have the appearance of concluding against any Providence at all. But he, at length, corrects himself for this extravagance of expression; and deliberately concludes that though the ways of God were somehow or other become unequal, yet that Providence had not deserted the case of mankind, but would at length bring the good man out of trouble. Yet *this is the confidence, which,* this most confident of all Critics says, *could* NOT POSSIBLY

arise but from the persuasion of an equal Providence: And for this it is that he charges me with a *fondness for reconciling contradictions.* Here I shall take my leave of this Discourser on the book of Job, with declaring, that a more contemptuous, disingenuous, and ignorant Writer never assumed the *honourable* name of ANSWERER; yet I would not deny him his station amongst the Learned. I think the same apology may be made for him, that a namesake of his, in his history of the Carthusians, made for their general Bruno,—"that doubtless he could have wrote well if he would, for he printed a Missal in an exceeding fair letter, and *delicate fine writing paper.*" PETREI Bib. Carth. fol. 35.

P. 134. FF. This wicked fancy some early *Christian* Writers seem to have gone far into; particularly ORIGEN; who, because Celsus had supposed, absurdly enough, that the propagators of the Gospel had borrowed the Doctrine of a *future state* from the Pagan Philosophers, was resolved not to be out-done, and therefore tells his adversary, "that where GOD says in the book of Moses, which was older than all the Pagan writings, *I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land, unto a good land and a large; unto a land flowing with milk and honey; unto the place of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites* [Exod. iii. 8.] he did not mean, as ignorant men imagine, the *country of Judea,* but the *kingdom of heaven;* for that how good a land soever Judea might be, it was yet part of that earth which had been put under the curse, and therefore, &c."—*οὐχ ὁρῶν ὅτι Μωϋσῆς, ὁ πολλῷ καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν γραμμάτων ἀρχαιότερος, εἰσήγαγε τὸν Θεὸν ἐπαγγελλόμενον τὴν ἁγίαν γῆν, καὶ ἀγαθὴν καὶ πολλὴν, ῥέουσαν γάλα καὶ μελι, τοῖς κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἑαυτοῦ βιώσασιν· οὐδ' ὡς οἴονταί τινες τὴν ἀγαθὴν, τὴν κάτω νομιζομένην Ἰουδαίαν, κειμένην καὶ αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀρχῆθεν κατηραμένῃ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ Ἀδὰμ γῆ.* *Cont. Cels.* p. 350. He that can rave at this strange rate must needs consider the whole sanction of *temporal* reward and punishment as a mere figurative representation of *future.* But is not the hearkening to such Interpreters exposing divine Revelation to the contempt and scorn of Infidels and Free-thinkers? And yet perhaps we must be obliged to hearken to them, if the endeavours of these Answerers become successful in proving the NON-EXISTENCE of the *extraordinary Providence* (as promised by Moses) against the reasoning of the D. L. that it was ACTUALLY administered, in pursuance of that promise. For, by Origen's Commentaries (published by Huetius) it appears, that he was led into this strange opinion by taking it for granted, as Sykes, Rutherforth, Stebbing, and such like writers have since done, that under the Law, the best and most pious men were frequently miserable, and the wicked prosperous and happy.

P. 149. GG. One of these Answerers of this Work employs much pains to prove that these words could not mean, *That it was to be well with them that fear God* IN THE PRESENT LIFE. Rutherforth, p. 363. i. e. he will prove, the words could not bear a sense to which they are limited and tied down by the words immediately following,—*But it shall not be well with the wicked,* NEITHER SHALL HE PROLONG HIS DAYS.—What is to be done with such a man?

P. 152. HH. Which (to observe it by the way) unanswerably confutes that Semipagan Dream of the *soul's sleeping till the resurrection of the body.* And yet, what is strange to tell, this very text, in the course of disputation, which, like the course of time, *brings things,* as the Poet says,

—to their confounding contraries,

hath been urged to prove *that sleep*, or *no separate life;* and this, by no less considerable a man than Mr. HALES of Eaton. *Christ* (saith he) *proveth the future resurrection of the dead from thence, that God is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but is not the God of the dead, but of the living.* Whence he concludeth, that *they live to God, that is,* SHALL BE *recalled to life by God, that he may manifest himself to be their God or Benefactor. This argument would be altogether fallacious, if before the Resurrection they felt heavenly joy: For then God would be their God or Benefactor, namely according to their souls, although their bodies should never rise again.** All which is a mere complication of mistakes: as is, indeed, his whole reasoning from Scripture, throughout that chapter.—But they who hold the soul to be only a quality, and yet talk of its *sleep* between death and the resurrection, use a jargon which confounds all languages as well as all reason. For such a *sleep* is an annihilation; and the *waking* again, a new creation.

P. 153. II. "Though this argument was a *new one*," (says Dr. Rutherforth) "though the Pharisees had never made this inference, and that therefore it does not appear from hence, that Moses *inculcated* the doctrine of a future state; yet as it was a conclusive argument, as it was an inference which *might have been made*, it will prove to us that Moses was not *studious to conceal* this doctrine, nor purposely omitted every thing that might bring his Reader acquainted with those notices of Redemption and of another life, which the Patriarchs were favoured with." p. 318. This is a coup de Maître, indeed: as wittily urged as it was wisely meditated. —*If Moses bring a conclusive argument for a doctrine, it is plain he could not be studious to conceal that doctrine*, says our ingenious Professor.—If Roger Bacon, say I, have given, in his writings, a true receipt to make Gunpowder, he *could not be studious* to conceal the composition. And yet we know he was studious to conceal it. What reasons he had for so doing, and how consistent it was with his giving the receipt, I leave to this profound Philosopher; and shall content myself with shewing how consistent Moses was in the conduct I have ascribed to him.—If both Moses's pretensions and those of Jesus likewise were true, the former must needs observe this conduct, in his Institute; that is to say, he would *omit* the doctrine of another life, and, at the same time, interweave into the Law such a secret mark of its truth, that, when the other Institution came, it might be clear to all, that he both knew and believed the Doctrine.—If Moses had not *omitted* it, he had intruded on the province of Jesus: If he had not *laid the grounds* on which it rises, he had neglected to provide for the proof of that connexion between the two Dispensations, necessary to shew the harmony between their respective Authors. Moses had done both: And from both I gather that he was *studious to conceal the doctrine.* The *omission* will be allowed to be one proof of it; and I should think, this use of a term, *The God of Abraham*, &c. is another proof. For, the Jews, who, from the ceasing of the extraordinary Providence, continued for many ages with incessant labour to ransack their Bibles for a proof of a future state, could never draw the inference from this text till Jesus had taught them the way. No, says the Doctor, *How should an argument used by Moses, for a future state, be a proof that Moses was studious to conceal it?* This Argument going, as we now see, upon our Professor's utter ignorance of the nature and genius of the Mosaic Dispensation, (which required as much that the grounds of a *future state* should be laid, as that the Structure itself should be kept out of sight) I shall leave it in possession of that admiration which it so well deserves.

P. 155. KK. Here, the groundless conceit of the learned Mosheim

* "A brief Inquiry," chap. viii.

[*de reb. Christ. ante Const.* p. 49,] is sufficiently refuted. He supposes a *Sadducee* to be represented under the person of the *rich Man*. But the authority of the PROPHETS, to which Abraham refers his houshold, was not acknowledged by the Sadducees, as of weight to decide, in this point. And yet the very words of Abraham suppose that their not *hearing the Prophets* did not proceed from their not *believing*, but from their not *regarding*.

P. 168. LL. But all are not *Arnaulds*, in the Gallican Church. Mr. *Freret*, speaking of the history of Saul and a passage in Isaiah, concerning the invocation of the dead, says—"*Ce qui augmente ma surprise, c'est de voir, que la plus part de ces Commentateurs se plaignent, de ne trouver dans l'Ecriture aucune preuve claire que les Juifs, au temps de Moyse, crussent l'immortalité de l'ame.*—La pratique, interdite aux Juifs, suppose que l'existence des ames, separées du corps, par la mort, etoit alors une opinion générale et populaire." *Memoires de l'Acad. Royale des Inscript. &c.* v. 23. p. 185.—The Gentleman's *surprise* arises from his being unable to distinguish between *the separate existence of the Soul* considered physically, and its *immortality* considered in a religious sense: It is under this latter consideration that *a future state of reward and punishment* is included. Had he not confounded these two things so different in themselves, he had never ventured to condemn the *Commentators;* who do indeed say, they cannot find this latter doctrine in the Pentateuch. But then, they do not *lament or complain* of this want; because they saw, though this Academician does not, that the absence of the doctrine of *a future State of reward and punishment* in the MOSAIC LAW evinces its imperfection, and verifies the enunciation of the *Gospel*, that LIFE AND IMMORTALITY *were brought to light by* JESUS CHRIST.

P. 172. MM. Dr. Stebbing, in what he calls *Considerations on the command to offer up Isaac*, hath attempted to discredit the account here given of the *Command:* And previously assures his reader, that *if any thing can hinder the ill effects which my interpretation must have upon Religion, it must be his exposing the absurdity of the conceit.* This is confidently said. But what then? He can prove it. So it is to be hoped. If not—However let us give him a fair hearing.—He criticises this observation on the word DAY, in the following manner. "Really, Sir, I see no manner of consequence in this reasoning. That Christ's day had reference to his office, as *Redeemer*, I grant. The day of Christ denotes the *time* when Christ should come, i. e. when *He* should come, who was to be such by office and employment. But why it must import also that when Christ came he should be offered up a Sacrifice, I do not in the least apprehend: Because I can very easily understand that Abraham might have been informed that Christ was to come, without being informed that he was to lay down his life as a Sacrifice. If Abraham saw that a time would come when one of his sons should take away the curse, he saw Christ's day." [Consid. p. 139.] At first setting out, (for I reckon for nothing this blundering, before he knew where he was, into a *Socinian* comment, the thing he most abhors) the Reader sees he grants the point I contend for—*That Christ's* DAY (says he) *has reference to his office as Redeemer, I grant.* Yet the very next words, employed to explain his meaning, contradict it;—*The day of Christ denotes the* TIME *when Christ should come.* All the sense therefore, I can make of his concession, when joined to his explanation of it, amounts to this—*Christ's Day has reference to his* OFFICE:—*No, not to his Office, but to his* TIME. He sets off well: but he improves as he goes along—*But why it must import* ALSO *that when Christ came he should be*

offered up as a Sacrifice, I do not in the least apprehend. Nor I, neither, I assure him. Had I said, that the word *Day*, in the text, imported the *time*, I could as little apprehend as he does, how that which imports *time*, imports ALSO the *thing done in time*. Let him take this nonsense therefore to himself. I argued in a plain manner thus,—When the word *Day* is used to express, in general, the period of any one's existence, then it denotes *time;* when, to express his peculiar office and employment, then it denotes, *not the time*, but that circumstance of life characteristic of such office and employment; or the *things done in time*. DAY, in the text, is used to express Christ's peculiar office and employment. Therefore—But what follows is still better. His want of apprehension, it seems, is founded in this, *that he can easily understand, that Abraham might have been informed that Christ was to come; without being informed that he was to lay down his life as a Sacrifice.* Yes, and so could I likewise; or I had never been at the pains of making the criticism on the word *Day:* which takes its force from this very truth, that Abraham might have been informed of one without the other. And, therefore, to prove he was informed of that *other*, I produced the text in question, which afforded the occasion of the criticism. He goes on,—*If Abraham saw, that a time would come when one of his seed should take away the curse, he saw Christ's* DAY. Without doubt he did. Because it is agreed, that *Day* may signify either time, or circumstance of action. But what is this to the purpose? The question is not whether the word may not, when used indefinitely, signify *time;* but whether it signifies *time* in this text. I have shewn it does not. And what has been said to prove it does? Why that it may do so in another place. In a word, all he here says, proceeds on a total inapprehension of the drift and purpose of the argument.

P. 173. NN. *Daubuz* on the *Revelations*, p. 251; printed in the year 1720. To this reasoning, Dr. Stebbing replies as follows: "You are not more successful in your next point, *Abraham rejoiced to see my Day, and he saw it, and was glad, ἵνα* ΙΔΗι *τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμὴν, καὶ* ΕΙΔΕ—*This* (say you) *evidently shews it* [the revelation] *to have been made not by relation in words, but by representation in actions.* How so? The reason follows. *The verb εἶδω is frequently used in the New Testament in its proper signification to see sensibly.*—In the New Testament, do you say? Yes, Sir, and in every Greek book you ever read in your life. What you SHOULD have said is, that it is so used here; and I suppose you would have said so, if you had known how to have proved it." [Consid. p. 139, 140.]

The reason follows (says he.) Where? In my book indeed, but not in his imperfect quotation from it; which breaks off before he comes to my reason. One who knew him not so well as I do, would suspect this was done to serve a purpose. No such matter; 'twas pure hap-hazard. He mistook the introduction of my argument for the argument itself. The argument itself, which he omits in the quotation, (and which was all I wanted, for the proof of my point,) was, *That the verb εἶδω, whether used literally or figuratively, always denotes a full intuition.* And this argument, I introduced in the following manner, *The verb εἶδω is frequently used in the New Testament in its proper signification, to see sensibly.* Unluckily, as I say, he took this for the Argument itself, and thus corrects me for it: "What you SHOULD have said, is, that it is so used here; and I suppose you would have said so, if you had known how to have proved it:" See, here, the true origin both of dogmatizing and divining! His *ignorance* of what I did say, leads him to tell me what I should have said, and to divine what I would have said. But, what I have said, I think I may stand to,

That the verb εἶδω always denotes a full intuition. This was all I wanted from the text; and on this foundation, I proceeded in the sequel of the discourse, to prove that Abraham *saw sensibly*. Therefore, when my Examiner takes it (as he does) for granted, that because, in this place, I had not proved that the Word implied to *see sensibly*, I had not proved it at all; he is a second time mistaken.

"But, *he owns*, that, if this was all, perhaps *I should* tell *him*, that it was a very strange answer of the *Jews, thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?*" [Consid. p. 140.] He is very right. He might be sure I would. In answer therefore to this difficulty, he goes on and says, "No doubt, Sir, the *Jews* answer our Saviour, as if he had said, that *Abraham* and *he* were *cotemporaries;* in which, they answered very foolishly, as they did on many other occasions; and the answer will as little agree with your interpretation as it does with mine. For does your interpretation suppose that *Abraham* saw *Christ* in person? No; you say it was by representation only." [Consid. p. 140, 141.]

The Jews answered our Saviour as if he had said that Abraham and he were cotemporaries.—Do they so? Why then, 'tis plain, *the expression was as strong in the Syrian language, used by Jesus, as in the Greek of his Historian*, which was all I aimed to prove by it. But *in this* (says he) *they answered very foolishly*. What then? Did I quote them for their wisdom? A little common sense is all I want of those with whom I have to deal: and rarely as my fortune hath been to meet with it, yet it is plain these Jews did not want it. For the *folly* of their answer arises therefrom. They heard Jesus use a word in their vulgar idiom, which signified to *see corporeally;* and common sense led them to conclude that he used it in the vulgar meaning: in this they were not mistaken. But, from thence, they inferred, that he meant it in the sense of *seeing personally;* and in this, they were. And now let the Reader judge whether the *folly* of their answer shews the *folly* of my Argument, or of my Examiner's.—Nay further, he tells us, they answered *as foolishly on many other occasions.* They did so; and I will remind him of one. Jesus says to Nicodemus, *Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*, &c.* Suppose now, from these words, I should attempt to prove that *Regeneration* and divine *Grace* were realities, and not mere metaphors: for that Jesus, in declaring the necessity of them, used such strong expressions that Nicodemus understood him to mean the being physically *born again, and entering the second time into the womb:* would it be sufficient, let me ask my Examiner, to reply in this manner: "No doubt, Sir, Nicodemus answered our Saviour as if he had said, that a follower of the Gospel must *enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born:* in which he answered very foolishly; and the answer will as little agree with your interpretation as it does with mine. For does your interpretation suppose he should so enter? No; but that he *should be born of water and of the spirit.*"—Would this, I say, be deemed, even by our Examiner himself, a sufficient answer? When he has resolved me this, I shall, perhaps, have something farther to say to him. In the mean time I go on. And, in returning him his last words restored to their subject, help him forward in the solution of what I expect from him.—*The answer* (says he) *will as little agree with your interpretation as it does with mine. For does your interpretation suppose that Abraham saw Christ in person? No; you say, it was by representation only.* Very well. Let me ask then, in the first place, Whether he supposes that what I said on this occasion was to prove that Abraham saw

* St. John iii. 3.

Christ from the reverend authority of his Jewish Adversaries: or to prove that the verb εἴδω signified to *see literally*, from their mistaken answer? He thought me here, it seems, in the way of those writers, who are quoting *Authorities*, when they should be giving *Reasons*. Hence, he calls the answer the Jews here gave, a *foolish one:* as if I had undertaken for its orthodoxy. But our Examiner is still farther mistaken. The point I was upon, in support of which I urged the answer of the Jews, was not the seeing *this* or *that person:* but the seeing *corporeally*, and not *mentally*. Now, if the Jews understood Jesus, as saying that Abraham saw *corporeally*, I concluded, that the expression, used by Jesus, had that import: and this was all I was concerned to prove. Difference, therefore, between their answer as I quoted it, and my interpretation, there was none. Their answer implied that Abraham was said to see *corporeally;* and my interpretation supposes that the words employed had that import. But to make a distinction where there was no difference, *seeing in person, and seeing by representation*, are brought in, to a question where they have nothing to do.

P. 176. OO. Ver. 10. et seq. By the account here given, of God's Dispensations to Abraham, may be seen the folly of that objection, brought with such insinuations of importance, against the divine appointment of *Circumcision*, from the *time* of its institution. Sir John Marsham observes, that *Abraham, when he went into Egypt, was not circumcised, nor for twenty years after his return.* "Abramus, quando Ægyptum ingressus est, nondum circumcisus erat, neque per annos amplius viginti post reditum," p. 73. Franeq. ed. 4to. And further, *that Circumcision was a most ancient rite amongst the Egyptians, that they had it from the beginning, and that it was a principle with them not to make use of the customs of other people.* "Apud Ægyptios circumcidendi ritus vetustissimus fuit, et ἀπ' ἀρχῆς institutus. Illi nullorum aliorum hominum institutis uti volunt," p. 74.—The noble Author of the CHARACTERISTICS, who never loses an opportunity of expressing his good-will to a *Prophet* or a *Patriarch*, takes up this pitiful suspicion after Marsham: "Before the time that Israel was constrained to go down to Egypt, and *sue for maintenance*,—the *Holy Patriarch Abraham* himself had been necessitated to this compliance on the same account.—'Tis certain that if this *Holy Patriarch*, who first instituted the sacred rite of Circumcision within his own family or tribe, had no regard to any Policy or Religion of the *Egyptians*, yet he had formerly been a Guest and Inhabitant of *Egypt* (where historians mention this to have been a national rite) long ere he had received any divine notice or Revelation concerning this affair." Vol. iii. p. 52, 53. These great men, we see, appeal to *Scripture*, for the support of their insinuation; which *Scripture* had they but considered with common attention, they might have found, that it gives us a chronological account of God's gradual Revelations to the *Holy Patriarch;* and therefore that, according to the order GOD was pleased to observe in his several Dispensations towards him, the Rite of Circumcision could not have been enjoined *before* the time Abraham happened to go into *Egypt;* nor indeed, at any other time than that in which we find it to be given; consequently that his journey into *Egypt* had not the least concern or connection with this affair: Nay, had these learned Critics but attended to their own observation, that the Rite of Circumcision was instituted twenty years after Abraham's return from *Egypt*, they must have seen the weakness of so partial a suspicion. For had this been after the model of an *Egyptian* rite, Abraham, in all likelihood, had been circumcised in *Egypt*, or at least very soon after his return: for in *Egypt*, it was a *personal*, not a *family* Rite. And we learn from prophane history, that those who went

from other Countries to *Egypt*, with a design to copy their manners, or to be initiated into their Wisdom, were, as a previous ceremony, commonly circumcised by the Egyptian Priests themselves.

P. 179. PP. To this Dr. Stebbing answers, "You lay it down here as the common interpretation, that the command to Abraham to offer up his son was given as a *trial only;* WHICH IS NOT TRUE." Why not? because "the common opinion is, that God's intention in this command was not only to TRY Abraham, but also to PREFIGURE the sacrifice of Christ." [Consid. p. 150.] Excellent! I speak of the Command's being given: but to whom? To all the Faithful, for whose sake it was recorded? or to Abraham only, for whose sake it was revealed? Does not the very subject confine my meaning to this latter sense? Now, to Abraham, I say, (according to the common opinion) it was given as a Trial only. To the faithful, if you will, as a prefiguration.—If, to extricate himself from this blunder or sophism, call it which you will, he will say it prefigured to Abraham likewise; he then gives up all he has been contending for; and establishes my interpretation, which is, that Abraham knew this to be a representation of the great sacrifice of Christ: I leave it undetermined whether he mistakes or cavils: See now, if he be not obliged to me. Where I speak of the common opinion, I say, *the command is supposed to be* GIVEN *as a Trial only*. He thinks fit to tell me, *I say not true*. But when he comes to prove it, he changes the terms of the question thus, "For the common opinion is, that GOD'S INTENTION in this command was," &c. Now God's intention of *giving* a command to Abraham, for Abraham's sake, might be one thing; and God's general intention of *giving* that Command, as it concerned the whole of his Dispensation, another. But to prove further that I *said not true*, when I said that, according to the common interpretation, the Command was given for a Trial only; he observes, that I myself had owned that the resemblance to Christ's sacrifice was so strong, that Interpreters could never overlook it. What then? If the Interpreters, who lived *after* Christ, could not overlook it, does it follow that Abraham, who lived *before*, could not overlook it neither? But the impertinence of this has been shewn already. Nor does the learned *Considerer* appear to be unconscious of it. Therefore, instead of attempting to inforce it to the purpose for which *he quotes it*, he turns, all on a sudden, to shew that it makes nothing to the purpose for which *I employed it*. But let us follow this Protean Sophister through all his windings.—"The resemblance" (says he) "no doubt, is very strong; but how this corroborates your sense of the command, I do not see. Your sense is, that it was an actual information given to Abraham, of the sacrifice of Christ. But to *prefigure*, and to *inform*, are different things. This transaction might prefigure, and does prefigure the sacrifice of Christ; whether Abraham knew any thing of the sacrifice of Christ or no. For it does not follow, that, because a thing is prefigured, therefore it must be seen and understood, at the time when it is prefigured." [*Consid.* pp. 150, 151.] Could it be believed that these words should immediately follow an argument, whose force (the little it has) is founded on the principle, *That to* PREFIGURE *and to* INFORM *are* NOT *different things?*

P. 179. QQ. To this reasoning, Dr. Stebbing replies, "But how can you prove that, according to the common interpretation, there was no reward subsequent to the trial?" [*Consid.* p. 151.] How shall I be able to please him?—Before, he was offended that I thought the Author of the book of Genesis might omit relating the *mode* of a fact, when he had good reason so to do. Here, where I suppose *no fact*, because there was none

recorded when no reason hindered, he is as captious on this side likewise. "How will you prove it?" (says he). From the silence of the Historian (say I) when nothing hindered him from speaking. Well, but he will shew it to be fairly recorded in Scripture, that there were rewards subsequent to the trial. This, indeed, is to the purpose: "Abraham" (says he) "lived a great many years after that transaction happened. He lived to dispose of his son Isaac in marriage, and to see his seed. He lived to be married himself to another Wife, and to have several children by her: He had not THEN received all God's mercies, nor were all God's dispensations towards him at an end; and it is to be remembered that it is expressly said of Abraham, Gen. xxiv. 1. (a long time after the transaction in question), *that God had blessed him in all things.*" [*Consid.* p. 151, 152.] The question here is of the extraordinary and peculiar rewards bestowed by God on Abraham; and he decides upon it, by an enumeration of the ordinary and common. And, to fill up the measure of these blessings, he makes the burying of his first wife and the marrying of a second to be one. Though unluckily, this second proves at last to be a Concubine; as appears plainly from the place where she is mentioned. But let me ask him seriously; Could he, indeed, suppose me to mean (though he attended not to the drift of the argument) that God immediately withdrew all the common blessings of his Providence from the Father of the Faithful, after the last extraordinary reward bestowed upon him, when he lived many years after? I can hardly, I own, account for this perversity, any otherwise than from a certain temper of mind which I am not at present disposed to give a name to: but which, the habit of *Answering* has made so common, that nobody either mistakes it, or is now indeed, much scandalized at it. Though for my part, I should esteem a total ignorance of letters a much happier lot than such a learned depravity.—"But this is not all," (says he)—No, is it not? I am sorry for it!—"What surprizes me most is, that you should argue so WEAKLY, as if the reward of good men had respect to this life only. Be it, that Abraham had received all God's mercies; and that all God's dispensations towards him, in this world, were at an end; was there not a life yet to come, with respect to which the whole period of our existence here is to be considered as a state of trial; and where we are all of us to look for that reward of our virtues which we very often fail of in this?" [*Consid.* p. 152.] Well, if it was *not all*, we find, at least, it is all of a piece. For, as before, he would sophistically obtrude upon us *common* for *extraordinary* REWARDS; so here (true to the mistery of his trade) he puts *common* for *extraordinary* TRIALS. *Our present existence* (says he) *is to be considered as a state of Trial.* The case, to which I applied my argument, was this;—"God, determining to select a chosen People from the loins of Abraham, would manifest to the world that this Patriarch was worthy of the distinction shewn unto him, by having his faith found superior to the hardest trials." Now, in speaking of these trials, I said, that the command to offer Isaac was the last. *No* (says the Examiner) *that cannot be, for, with respect to a life to come, the whole period of our existence here, is to be considered as a state of* TRIAL." And so again (says he) with regard to the REWARD; which you pretend, in the order of God's Dispensation, should follow the trial: Why, we are to *look for it in another world.*—Holy Scripture records the history of one, to whom God only promised (in the clear and obvious sense) *temporal* blessings. It tells us that these temporal blessings were dispensed. One species of which were extraordinary Rewards after extraordinary Trials. In the most extraordinary of all, no Reward followed: This was my diffi-

culty. See here, how he has cleared it up. Hardly indeed to his own satisfaction: for he tries to save all by another fetch; the weakest men being ever most fruitful in expedients, as the slowest animals have commonly the most feet. "And what" (says he) "if after all this, the wisdom of God should have thought fit, that this very man, whom he had singled out to be an eminent example of piety to all generations; should, at the very close of his life, give evidence of it, by an instance that exceeded all that had gone before; that he might be a pattern of patient suffering even unto the end? Would there not be SENSE in such a supposition?" [*Consid.* p. 153.] In truth, I doubt not, as he hath put it: And I will tell him, Why. Abraham was not a mere instrument to stand for an Example only; but a moral Agent likewise; and to be dealt with as such. Now, though, as he stands for an *Example*, we may admit of as many *Trials of patient suffering* as this good-natured Divine thinks fitting to impose; yet, as a *moral Agent*, it is required (if we can conclude any thing from the method of God's dealing with his Servants, recorded in sacred history) that each Trial be attended with some work done, or some reward conferred. But these two parts in Abraham's character, our *Considerer* perpetually confounds. He supposes nothing to be done for Abraham's own sake; but every thing for the Example's sake. Yet, did the good old cause of *Answering* require, he could as easily suppose the contrary. And to shew I do him no wrong, I will here give the Reader an instance of his dexterity, in the counter-exercise of his arms. In p. 150 of these *Considerations* (he says) "IT DOES NOT FOLLOW, that, because a thing is prefigured, therefore it must be seen and understood AT THE TIME when it is prefigured." Yet in the body of the Pamphlet, at pp. 112, 113, having another point to puzzle; he says (on my observing that a future State and Resurrection were not national Doctrines till the time of the Maccabees) "he knows I will say they had these doctrines from the Prophets—yet the Prophets were dead two hundred years before."—But if the Prophets were dead, their Writings were extant—"And what then? is it LIKELY that the sons should have learnt from the dead Prophets what the Fathers could not learn from the living?—Why could not the Jews learn this Doctrine from THE VERY FIRST, as well as their Posterity at the distance of ages afterwards?" In the first case we find he expressly says, it *does not* follow; in the second, he as plainly supposes, that it *does*.

P. 180. RR. And yet an ingenious man, one M. Bouiller, in a late Latin Dissertation, accuses me of concealing, that Chrysostom, Erasmus, and others, were of *my opinion*, viz. that Abraham in the Command to sacrifice his Son was informed, of what he earnestly desired to know, that the redemption of Mankind was to be obtained by the sacrifice of the Son of God. The Reader now sees, whether the Author of the Divine Legation was guilty of a concealed theft, or his Accuser of an open blunder, under which he covers his orthodoxal malignity. Yet he thinks he atones for all, by calling *The Divine Legation egregium opus: ubi ingenium acerrimum cum eximia eruditione certat.*—Dissertationum Sacr. Sylloge, p. 194.

P. 181. SS. To this, the great Professor replies, That "there are but few gestures of the body more apt *of themselves* to signify the sentiment of the mind than articulate sound: The force of which arises not from the nature of things; but from the arbitrary will of man: and common use and custom imposes this signification on articulate sounds, not on motions and gestures"—"Pauci sunt motus corporis, qui ipsi per se aptiores esse videntur ad motus animi significandos, quam sonus qui ore et lingua in vocem formatur. Vis ipsa non est in natura rerum posita, sed arbitrio

hominum constituta ; eamque mos et usus communis non gestibus corporis tribuit, sed verbis et voci." RUTHERFORTH, *Determ.*

The purpose of this fine observation, though so cloudily expressed, is to shew that *motion and gesture* can have no signification at all: Not from *nature*, since few gestures of the body are more apt of themselves to express the mind than articulate sound ; and yet articulate sound is of arbitrary signification : Not from *institution*, since it is not to gesture, but to articulate sound, that men have agreed to affix a meaning. The consequence is, that *gesture can have no meaning at all ;* and so there is an end of all Abraham's SIGNIFICATIVE ACTION. The Divine would make a great figure, were it not for his Bible ; but the Bible is perpetually disorienting the Philosopher. His general Thesis is, "That *actions* can never become significative but by the aid of *words*." Now I desire to know what he thinks of all the TYPICAL Rites of the *Law*, significative of the Sacrifice of Christ ? Were not these *Actions ?* Had they no meaning which extended to the *Gospel ?* or were there any *Words* to accompany them, which explained that meaning ? Yet has this man asserted, in what he calls a *Determination*, that in the instances of expressive gesture, recorded in Scripture, *words were always used in conjunction with them.* But to come a little closer to him. As a Philosopher he should have given his Reasons for those two assertions ; or as an Historian he should have verified his Facts. He hath attempted neither ; and I commend his prudence ; for both are against him : His Fact, that gestures have no meaning by *nature*, is false : and his Reasoning, that they have none by *institution*, is mistaken. The Spartans might instruct him that *gestures alone have a natural meaning.* That sage People (as we are told by Herodotus) were so persuaded of this truth, that they preferred converse by *action*, to converse by *speech ;* as action had all the clearness of speech, and was free from the abuses of it. This Historian, in his Thalia, informs us, that when the Samians sent to Lacedemon for succours in distress, their Orators made a long and laboured speech. When it was ended, the Spartans told them, that *the first part of it they had forgotten, and could not comprehend the latter.* Whereupon the Samian Orators produced their empty Bread-baskets, and *said*, they wanted bread. *What need of words*, replied the Spartans, *do not your empty Bread-baskets sufficiently declare your meaning ?* Thus we see the Spartans thought not only that *gestures were apt of themselves* (or by nature) *to signify the sentiment of the mind*, but even *more apt than articulate sounds.* Their relations, the Jews, were in the same sentiments and practice ; and full as sparing of their words ; and (the two languages considered) for something a better reason. The sacred Historian, speaking of public days of humiliation, tells his story in this manner—*And they gathered together to Mizpeh*, AND DREW WATER AND POURED IT OUT BEFORE THE LORD, *and fasted on that day*, 1 Sam. chap. vii. ver. 6. The Historian does not explain in *words* the meaning of this *drawing of water*, &c. nor needed he. It sufficiently expressed, that *a deluge of tears was due for their offences.* The Professor, perhaps, will say that words accompanied the action, at least preceded it. But what will he say to the action of Tarquin, when he struck off the heads of the higher poppies which overtopped their fellows ? Here we are expressly told, that all was done in profound silence, and yet the action was well understood. But further, I will tell our Professor what he least suspected, that Gestures, besides their *natural*, have often an *arbitrary* signification. "A certain Asiatic Prince, entertained at Rome by Augustus, was, amongst other Shews and Festivities, amused with a famous Pantomime ; whose actions

were so expressive, that the Barbarian begged him of the Emperor for his Interpreter between him and several neighbouring Nations, whose languages were unknown to one another." Pantomimic gesture was amongst the Romans one way of exhibiting a Dramatic Story. But before such gestures could be formed into a continued series of Information, we cannot but suppose much previous pains and habit of invention to be exerted by the Actors. Amongst which, one expedient must needs be (in order to make the expression of the Actors convey an entire connected sense) to intermix with the gestures *naturally* significative, gestures made significative by *institution;* that is, brought, by *arbitrary* use, to have as determined a meaning as the others.

To illustrate this by that more lasting information, the *Hieroglyphics* of the Egyptians, and the *real Characters* of the Chinese; which, as we have shewn, run parallel with the more fleeting conveyance of expressive gesture, just as alphabetic writing does with speech. Now, though the earlier Hieroglyphics were composed almost altogether of marks *naturally* significative, yet when the Egyptians came to convey continued and more precise discourses by this mode of writing, they found a necessity of inventing arbitrary significations, to intermix and connect with the other marks which had a *natural*. [See vol. ii. p. 179, et seq.]

Now, to shew that these arbitrary Hieroglyphic marks were real Characters like the other, let us turn to the Characters of the Chinese, which though (in their present way of use) most of them be of *arbitrary* signification, yet the Missionaries assure us that they are understood by all the neighbouring nations of different languages. This shews that the Augustan Pantomime, so coveted by the Barbarian for his interpreter, might be very able to discharge his function, though several of his gestures had an arbitrary signification. And we easily conceive how it might come to pass, since the gesture of *arbitrary* signification only served to connect the active discourse, by standing between others of a *natural* signification, directing to their sense.

Thus (to conclude with our Determiner) it appears that GESTURES ALONE are so far from having no meaning at all, as he has ventured to affirm, that they have all the meaning which human expression can possibly convey: all which is properly their own, namely *natural* information; and even much of that which is more peculiar to speech, namely *arbitrary*.

To illustrate the whole by a domestic instance; the solemn gesture of a Professor in his Chair; which sometimes may *naturally* happen, to signify Folly; though, by *institution*, it always signifies Wisdom; and yet again, it must be owned, in justice to our Professor's scheme, that sometimes it means nothing at all.

P. 184. TT. Would the reader now believe it possible, when these words lay before Dr. Stebbing, while he was answering my Book, that he should venture to ask me, or be capable of asking these insulting questions —*Was there any good use that Abraham could make of this knowledge which the rest of the People of God might not have made of it as well as He? Or if it was unfit for every body else, was it not unfit for Abraham too?*

P. 185. UU. But all I can say, or all an Apostle can say, if I chance to say it after him, will not satisfy Dr. Stebbing. He yet sticks to his point, "That if any information of the death and sacrifice of Christ had been intended, it is NATURAL TO THINK that the explanation would have been Recorded with the transaction, as it is in all other SUCH LIKE CASES." Now if this orthodox Gentleman will shew me *a such like case*, i. e. a case where a Revelation of the Gospel Dispensation is made by an expressive action,

and the explanation is recorded along with it, I shall be ready to confess, he has made a pertinent objection. In the mean time, I have something more to say to him. He supposes, that this commanded Sacrifice of Isaac was a TYPE of the Sacrifice of Christ. To this a Deist replies, in the Doctor's own words, "If any type had been here intended, it is natural to think that the explanation would have been recorded with the transaction." Now when the Doctor has satisfied the objection, which he has lent the Deists, against a TYPE, I suppose it may serve to satisfy himself, when he urges it against my idea of the Command, as an INFORMATION BY ACTION. Again, our Answerer himself affirms that the doctrine of Redemption was delivered under *Types* in the Law; and that the doctrine thus delivered was designedly secreted and concealed from the ancient Jews. Now is it *natural to think* (to use his own words) that Moses would openly and plainly record a Doctrine in one book which he had determined to secrete in another, when both were for the use of the same People and the same Age?

P. 185. XX. "You must give me leave to observe" (says Dr. Stebbing) "that the transaction in question will have the same efficacy to shew *the dependency between the two dispensations*, whether Abraham had thereby any information of the Sacrifice of Christ or not." [Consid. p. 156.] This, indeed, is saying something. And, could he prove what he says, it would be depriving my interpretation of one of its principal advantages. Let us see then how he goes about it,—"for this does not arise from Abraham's KNOWLEDGE, or any body's KNOWLEDGE, at the time when the transaction happened, but from the similitude and correspondency between the event and the transaction, by which it was prefigured; which is exactly the same upon either supposition." [Ibid. pp. 156, 157.] To this I reply, 1. That I never supposed that the dependency between the two Dispensations did *arise from Abraham's knowledge, or any body's knowledge*, at that, or at any other time; but from God's INTENTION that this commanded action should import or represent the Sacrifice of Christ: and then indeed comes in the question, Whether that *Intention* be best discovered from God's *declaration* of it to Abraham, or from a *similitude and correspondency* between this commanded action and the Sacrifice of Christ. Therefore, 2. I make bold to tell him, that a *similitude and correspondency between the event and the transaction which prefigured it*, IS NOT ENOUGH to shew this *dependency*, to the satisfaction of Unbelievers; who say, that a likeness between two things of the same nature, such as offering up two men to death, in different ways, and transacted in two distant periods, is not sufficient alone to shew that they had any relation to one another. With the same reason, they will say, we might pretend that Jephtha's daughter, or the king of Moab's son whom the father sacrificed on the wall, 2 Kings iii. 27. were the types of Christ's sacrifice. Give us, they exult, a proof from Scripture that God declared or revealed his INTENTION of prefiguring the death of Jesus; or some better authority at least than a modern Typifier, who deals only in *similitudes* and *correspondences*, and has all the wildness, without the wit, of a Poet, and all the weakness, without the ingenuity, of an Analogist! Now whether it be our Examiner, or the Author of the *Divine Legation*, who has given them this satisfaction, or whether they have any reason to require it of either of us, is left to the impartial Reader to consider.

P. 186. YY. Let us see now what Dr. Stebbing has to say to this reasoning—"By your leave, Sir," says he, (which, by the way, he never asks, but to abuse me; nor ever takes, but to misrepresent me) "if the Apostle had meant by this expression, to signify that Isaac stood as the Representa-

tive of Christ, and that his being taken from the mount alive, was the figure of Christ's Resurrection; it SHOULD have been said, that Abraham received CHRIST from the dead in a figure." *Should* it so? What? where the discourse was not concerning *Christ*, but *Isaac?* Had, indeed, the sacred Writer been speaking of Abraham's *knowledge of Christ*, something might have been said; but he is speaking of a very different thing, his *faith in God;* and only intimates, by a strong expression, what he understood that action to be, which he gives, as an instance of the most illustrious act of *faith*. I say, had this been the case, something might have been said; something, I mean, just to keep him in countenance; yet still, nothing to the purpose, as I shall now shew. The transaction of the Sacrifice of Christ related to GOD. The *figure* of that transaction, in the command to offer Isaac, related (according to my interpretation) to ABRAHAM. Now, it was God who received Christ; as it was Abraham who received the type or figure of Christ, in Isaac. To tell us then, that (according to my interpretation) it SHOULD *have been said, that Abraham received* CHRIST *from the dead in a figure*, is, in effect, telling us that he knows no more of logical expression than of theological reasoning. It is true, could he shew the expression improper, in the sense which I give to the transaction, he would then speak a little to the purpose; and this, to do him justice, is what he would fain be at.—"For, Christ it was, according to your interpretation," (says he) "that was received from the dead in a figure, by Isaac his Representative, who really came alive from the mount. If the reading had been, not ἐν παραβολῇ, but εἰς παραβολὴν, it would have suited your notion; for it might properly have been said, that Isaac came alive from the mount *as* a figure, or *that he might be* a figure, of the Resurrection of Christ." [Consid. p. 147.] Miserable chicane! As, on the one hand, I might say with propriety, that CHRIST *was received from the dead in a figure*, i. e. BY a representative: so on the other, I might say that ISAAC *was received from the dead in a figure*, i. e. AS a representative? For Isaac sustaining the person of Christ, who was raised from the dead, might *in a figure*, i. e. as that person, be said to be received: yet this our Examiner denies, and tells us, the Apostle SHOULD *have said that Abraham received* CHRIST, and not ISAAC.—"But" (adds he) "if the reading had been not ἐν Παραβολῇ, but εἰς Παραβολὴν, it would have suited your notion." And the reason he gives, is this: "For it might properly have been said that Isaac came alive from the mount AS a figure, or THAT HE MIGHT BE a figure of the resurrection of Christ." Strange! He says, this would have suited *my* notion; and the reason he gives, shews it suits only *his own;* which is that the exactness of the resemblance between the two actions, not the declaration of the Giver of the Command, made it a figure. This is the more extraordinary, as I myself have here shewn that the old Latin translator had turned the words into IN PARABOLAM instead of IN PARABOLA for this very reason, because he understood the command in the sense our Examiner contends for; viz. That Isaac, by the *resemblance* of the actions, MIGHT BE, or might become a figure.

However, he owns at last that "a reason will still be wanting, why, instead of speaking the fact as it really was, that Isaac came alive from the mount; the Apostle chose rather to say (what was not really the case) that Abraham received him *from the dead.*" [Consid. pp. 147, 148.] Well; and have I not given a reason? No matter for that: Dr. Stebbing is turned *Examiner*, and has engrossed the market. His reason follows thus, "If Isaac did not die (as it is certain he did not) Abraham could not receive him from the dead. And yet the Apostle says, he received him *from the*

dead. The clearing up this difficulty will shew the true sense of the passage." [Consid. pp. 147, 148.] What, will the clearing up a difficulty of his own making discover the true sense of another man's writing? This is one of his new improvements in Logic; in which, as in Arithmetic, he has invented a *rule of false*, to discover an unknown truth. For there is none of this difficulty in the sacred Text; it is not there (as in our Examiner) said simply, that *Abraham received Isaac from the dead*, but that he *received him from the dead* IN A FIGURE, or under the assumed personage of *Christ*. Now if *Christ* died, then he, who assumed his personage, in order to represent his passion and resurrection, might surely be said to be *received from the dead in a figure*. A wonderful *difficulty* truly! and we shall see, as wonderfully solved;—by a conundrum! But with propriety enough. For as a real difficulty requires sense and criticism to resolve it, an imaginary one may be well enough managed by a quibble.—Because the translators of St. Mark's Gospel have rendered *ἐν ποίᾳ παραβολῇ*, by *with what comparison shall we compare it*, therefore, *ἐν παραβολῇ*, in the text in question, signifies COMPARATIVELY SPEAKING. But no words can shew him like his own—"The Apostle does not say *simply and absolutely*, that Abraham received Isaac from the dead; but that he received him from the dead *ἐν παραβολῇ, in a parable.*" See here now! Did not I tell you so? There was no difficulty all this while: The sentence only opened to the right and left to let in a blustering objection, which is no sooner evaporated than it closes again as before. *It was not simply said*—No. "But that he received him—*ἐν παραβολῇ, in a parable*, i. e. *in a comparison*, or *by comparison*. Thus the word is used, Mark iv. 30. *Whereunto shall we liken the kingdom of God, or with what* COMPARISON [*ἐν ποίᾳ παραβολῇ*] *shall we compare it.* The meaning then may be, that Abraham's receiving Isaac alive (after his death was denounced) by the revocation of the command; was AS IF HE HAD received him from the dead. Thus several Interpreters understand the place. Or it may be, as others will have it, that the Apostle here refers to the birth of Isaac; which was [*ἐν παραβολῇ*] COMPARATIVELY SPEAKING, a receiving him from the dead; his father being old, and his mother past the age of child-bearing, on which account the Apostle styles them both *dead*. Which interpretation, I the rather approve, because it suggests the proper grounds of Abraham's faith." [Consid. pp. 148, 149.]

He says, *ἐν παραβολῇ* signifies *in or by comparison;* and that the word is so used in St. Mark; to prove which, he quotes the English translation. Now I must take the liberty to tell him, that the translators were mistaken; and he with them. *Παραβολῇ*, in St. Mark, is not used in the sense of a *similitude* or *comparison*, but of a *parable*. The ancients had two ways of illustrating the things they inforced; the one was by a *parable*, the other by a simple *comparison* or *simile:* how the latter of these arose out of the former I have shewn in the third Volume.* Here, both these modes of illustration are referred to; which should have been translated thus, *To what shall we* COMPARE *the kingdom of God, or with what* PARABLE *shall we illustrate or parabolize it.*—*ὁμοιώσωμεν—παραβάλωμεν*—which words express two different and well-known modes of illustration.

But now suppose *ἐν ποίᾳ παραβολῇ* had signified *with what comparison:* How comes it to pass that *ἐν παραβολῇ* should signify *by comparison*, or *as it were*, or COMPARATIVELY SPEAKING? In plain truth, his critical analogy has ended in a pleasant blunder. How so? you will ask. Nay, 'tis true there's no denying, but that *speaking by comparison* is *comparatively speaking;* and, if men will put another sense upon it, who can help that? they

* Book iv. sect. iv. p. 210, et seq.

say, *comparatively speaking* signifies the speaking loosely, inaccurately, and incorrectly. But was it for our Doctor to put his reader in mind of such kind of speakers? But the charge of a blunder, an innocent mishap, I am ready to retract; for I observe him to go into it with much artful preparation; a circumstance which by no means marks that genuine turn of mind, which is quick and sudden, and over head and ears, in an instant: He begins with explaining,—*in a comparison*, by—*by comparison:* where you just get the first glimpse, as it were, of an enascent equivocation; and his *by comparison* is presently afterwards turned into as *it were*, or *as if he had;* and then, *comparatively speaking* brings up the rear, and closes the criticism three deep.

P. 188. ZZ. Dr. Stebbing goes on as usual—"In short, Sir, I do not understand this Doctrine (with which your whole work much abounds) of revealing things clearly to Patriarchs, and Prophets, and Leaders, as a special favour to themselves; but to be kept as a secret from the rest of Mankind."—It is but too plain *he does not understand it:* for which I can give no better reason than that it is the Scripture-doctrine, and not the doctrine of Summs and Systems. "I have been *used*" (says he) "to consider persons under this character, as appointed, not for themselves, but for others; and therefore to conclude that WHATEVER was clearly revealed to them, concerning God's Dispensations, was so revealed in order to be communicated to others." * This is the old sophism; "That, because Persons act and are employed for others; therefore, they do nothing, and have nothing done for themselves." When God said, *Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do?* was not this said to, and for himself?—But he has another to match it, "That whatever was clearly revealed *to the Prophets*, was so revealed, in order to be communicated to others." Here then, a little Scripture-doctrine will do him no harm. Did Moses communicate all he knew to the Jews, concerning the *Christian Dispensation;* which the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us was clearly revealed to him in the mount?—*Priests* (says he) *that offer gifts according to the Law, who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the Tabernacle.*† Again, we find that Ezekiel, on his being called out, upon his mission, saw (what the author of Ecclesiasticus calls) *the glorious vision;* and had (as appears from the allegory of the roll of a book) a full interpretation thereof. Yet, notwithstanding all his illumination, he was directed by God to speak so obscurely to the People, that he found cause to complain,—*Ah Lord, they say of me! Doth he not speak parables?* ‡ And now let him ask the Prophets in the same magisterial language he is accustomed to examine me, *Was there any good use you could make of your knowledge, that the People of God might not have made of it as well as you?*—But this very Dispensation is alluded to, and continued, under the kingdom of Christ. *And his Disciples asked him saying, What might this parable be?* And he said, *Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God: But to others, in parables; that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand.*§ Again, St. John in his visions tells us,—*And when the seven thunders had uttered their voices, I was about to write. And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me,* SEAL UP *those things which the seven thunders uttered, and* WRITE THEM NOT. Rev. x. 4. And now, reader, I shall try his gratitude!—"If you can shew," *(says he)* "that I am mistaken in this, pray do it, and I shall be obliged to you." ‖ You see, I have taken

* "Considerations," pp. 155, 156. † Heb. viii. 4, 5. ‡ Ezek. xx. 49.
§ Luke viii 9, 10. ‖ "Considerations," p. 156.

him at his word. And it was well I did; for it was no sooner out of his mouth, than, as if he had repented, not of his candour, but his confidence, he immediately cries, Hold—and tells me, "I might have spared myself in asking another question, *Why, if Revelations cannot be clearly recorded, are they recorded at all?*" * But, great *Defender of the Faith!*—of the ancient Jewish Church, I mean, I asked that question, because the answer to it shews how much you are mistaken; as the intelligent Reader, by this time, easily perceives. But why does he say I might have *spared that question?*—Because "if a Revelation is not clearly given, it cannot be clearly recorded." † Did I say it could? Or will he say, that there are no reasons why a Revelation, that is clearly given, should be obscurely recorded? To what purpose then, was the observation made? Made? why to introduce another: for, with our equivocal Examiner, the corruption of argument is the generation of cavil.—"And yet" *(says he)* "as YOU INTIMATE, there may be reasons why an OBSCURE REVELATION should be recorded, to wit, for the instruction of future ages, when, the obscurity being cleared up by the event, it shall appear, that it was foreseen and fore-ordained in the knowledge and appointment of God." ‡ If thou wilt believe me, Reader, I never *intimated* any thing so absurd.

What I *intimated* was not concerning an *obscure Revelation*, but a *Revelation obscurely recorded*. These are very different things, as appears from hence, that the latter may be a *clear Revelation;* the word being relative to him to whom the Revelation was made. But this is a peccadillo only. However he approves the reason of *recording:* for that, thereby, "it shall appear, that IT was foreseen and foreordained by God." IT,—What? The *obscure Revelation*, according to grammatical construction: but, in his English, I suppose, IT stands for the *fact revealed*. Well then; from the recording of an obscure revelation, he says it will appear, when the foretold fact happens, that it was foreseen and pre-ordained by God. This too he tells the Reader I *intimated;* but sure, the Reader can never think me so silly: For every fact, whether prefigured and foretold, or not prefigured and foretold, must needs have been foreseen and pre-ordained by God. Now, whether we are to ascribe this to exactness, or to inaccuracy, of expression, is hard to say. For I find him a great master in that species of composition which a celebrated French Writer, in his encomium on the *Revelation*, calls, *en clarté noire*. However, think what we will of his head, his heart lies too open to be misjudged of.

P. 188. AAA. This infidel objection, the Reader sees, consists of two parts: the one, that Abraham must needs doubt of the Author of the Command: the other, that he would be misled, by conceiving amiss of his Attributes, to believe *human sacrifices* were grateful to him. Dr. Stebbing, who will leave nothing *unanswered*, will needs answer this, [Consid. pp. 158, 160.] To the first part he replies, partly by the assistance I myself had given him, (where I took notice of what might be urged by Believers, as of *great weight and validity)* and partly from what he had picked up elsewhere. But here I shall avoid imitating his example, who, in spite to the Author of arguments professedly brought in support of Religion, strives, with all his might, to shew their invalidity; an employment, one would think, little becoming a Christian Divine. If the common arguments against the objection, here urged by him with great pomp, have any weak parts, I shall leave them to Unbelievers to find out—I have the more reason likewise to trust them to their own *weight*, both because they are none of his, and because I have acknowledged their validity. For which

* "Considerations," p. 156. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid.

acknowledgment, all I get is this—*Whether you had owned this or not* (says he) *I should have taken upon myself the proof.* Whereas, all that he has *taken* is the property of other Writers; made his own, indeed, by a weak and an imperfect representation.—But his answer to the second part of the infidel objection must not be passed over so slightly. "As to the latter part of the objection" (says he) "that *from this command, Abraham and his family must needs have thought human sacrifices acceptable to God;* the revoking the command at last was a sufficient guard against any such construction. To this you make the Unbeliever answer; *No, because the action having been commanded ought to have been condemned; and a simple revocation was no condemnation.* But why was not the revocation of the Command, in this case, a condemnation of the action? If I should tempt you to go and kill your next neighbour, and afterwards come and desire you not to do it; would not this after-declaration be as good an evidence of my dislike to the action, as the first was of my approbation of it? Yes, and a much better, as it may be presumed to have been the result of maturer deliberation. Now, though deliberation and after-thought are not incident to God; yet as God in this case condescended (as you say, and very truly) to act after the manner of men; the same construction should be put upon his actions, as are usually put upon the actions of men in like cases." [Consid. p. 160, 161.] Now, though, as was said above, I would pay all decent regard becoming a friend of Revelation, to the common arguments of others in its defence, yet I must not betray my own. I confessed they had great *weight and validity;* yet, at the same time, I asserted, they were attended with *insuperable difficulties.* And while I so think, I must beg leave to inforce my reasons for this opinion; and, I hope without offence; as the arguments, I am now about to examine, are purely this Writer's own. And the Reader, by this time, has seen too much of him to be apprehensive, that the lessening his Authority will be attended with any great disservice to Religion.

I had observed, that the reasonings of Unbelievers on this case, as it is commonly explained, were not devoid of all plausibility, when they proceeded thus,—"That as Abraham lived amongst Heathens, whose highest act of divine worship was *human sacrifices;* if God had commanded that Act, and, on the point of performance, only remitted it as a favour, (and so it is represented;) without declaring the iniquity of the practice, when addressed to Idols; or his abhorrence of it, when directed to himself; the Family must have been misled in their ideas concerning the moral rectitude of that species of religious worship: Therefore, God, in these circumstances, had he commanded the action as a *trial only*, would have explicitly condemned that mode of worship, as immoral. But he is not represented as condemning, but as remitting it for a *favour:* Consequently, say the Unbelievers, God did not command the action at all."—To this our Examiner replies,—*But why? Was not the revocation of the command, a condemnation of the action? If I should tempt you to go and kill your next neighbour, and afterwards come and* DESIRE *you not to do it, would not this after-declaration be as good an evidence of my dislike to the action, as the first was of my approbation of it?* To this I reply; That the cases are by no means parallel, either in themselves, or in their circumstances: Not *in themselves;* the murder of our next neighbour was, amongst all the Gentiles of that time, esteemed a high immorality; while, on the contrary, human sacrifice was a very holy and acceptable part of divine Worship: Not in *their circumstances:* the *desire* to forbear the murder tempted to, is (in the case he puts) represented as *repentance;* whereas the stop

put to the sacrifice of Isaac (in the case Moses puts) is represented as *favour*.

But what follows, I could wish (for the honour of modern Theology) that the method I have observed would permit me to pass over in silence.—*Now though deliberation and after-thought* (says he) *are not incident to God, yet, as God, in this case, condescended (as you say, and very truly) to act after the manner of men; the same construction should be put upon his actions, as is usually put upon the actions of men in like cases.* [Consid. p. 155, 156.] That is, though *deliberation* and *after-thought* are not incident to God; yet you are to understand his actions, as if they were incident. A horrid interpretation! And yet his representation of the Command, and his decent illustration of it, by a *murderer in intention*, will not suffer us to understand it in any other manner: For God, as if in haste, and before due deliberation, is represented as commanding an immoral action; yet again, as it were by an *after-thought*, ordering it to be foreborn, by reason of its immorality. And in what is all this impious jargon founded? If you will believe him, in the principle I lay down, *That God condescends to act after the manner of men.* I have all along had occasion to complain of his misrepresenting my Principles: but then they were Principles he disliked: and this, the modern management of controversy has sanctified. But here, though the Principle be approved, yet he cannot for his life forbear to misrepresent it: So bad a thing is an evil habit. Let me tell him then, that by the principle of *God's condescending to act after the manner of men*, is not meant, that he ever acts in compliance to those vices and superstitions, which arise from the depravity of human Will; but in conformity only to men's indifferent manners and customs; and to those Usages which result only from the finite imperfections of their nature. Thus though, as in the case before us, God was pleased, in conformity to their mode of information, to use their custom of revoking a Command; yet he never condescended to imitate (as our Examiner supposes) the irresolution, the repentance, and horrors of conscience of a *murderer in intention*. Which (horrible to think!) is the parallel this orthodox Divine brings to illustrate the Command to Abraham. But he had read that God is sometimes said to *repent*; and he thought, I suppose, it answered to that repentance which the stings of conscience sometimes produce in bad men. Whereas it is said, in conformity to a good magistrate's or parent's correption of vice; first, to threaten punishment; and then, on the offender's amendment, to remit it.

But he goes on without any signs of remorse.—"*Nor will the Pagan fable of Diana's substituting a Hind in the place of Iphigenia* at all help your Unbeliever. *This did not*, say they, OR YOU FOR THEM, *make idolaters believe that she therefore abhorred human sacrifices.* But do not they themselves, or have not you assigned a very proper and sufficient reason why it did not, viz. that they had been *before persuaded of the contrary?* Where human sacrifices make a part of the settled standing Religion; the refusal to accept a human sacrifice in one instance may, indeed, be rather looked upon as a particular indulgence, than as a declaration against the thing in gross. But where the thing was commanded but in one single instance, and the command revoked in that very instance, (which is our present case) such revocation, in all reasonable construction, is as effectual a condemnation of the thing, as if God had told Abraham, in so many words, that he delighted not in human sacrifices." [Consid. p. 161.] To come to our Examiner's half-buried sense, we are often obliged to remove, or, what is still a more disagreeable labour, to sift well, the rubbish of his words. He says, the *revocation* was an *effectual condemnation*. This may either

signify, That men, now free from the prejudices of Pagan superstition, may see that human sacrifices were condemned by the revocation of the Command: or, That Abraham's family could see this. In the first sense, I have nothing to do with his proposition; and in the second, I shall take the liberty to say it is not true. I deny that the *revocation* was an *effectual condemnation*. With how good reason let the Reader now judge.

Abraham, for the great ends of God's Providence, was called out of an idolatrous city, infected, as all such cities then were, with this horrid superstition. He was himself an Idolater, as appears from the words of Joshua. —*Your Fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, even Terah the father of Abraham, and the father of Nachor: and* THEY *served other Gods. And I took your father Abraham, &c.** God, in the act of calling him, instructed him in the Unity of his Nature, and the error of Polytheism; as the great principle, for the sake of which (and to preserve it in one Family amidst an universal overflow of idolatry) he was called out.—That he must be prejudiced in favour of his Country superstitions, is not to be doubted; because it is of human nature to be so: and yet we find no particular instruction given him, concerning the superstition in question. The noble Author of the *Characteristics* observes, that "it appears that he was under no extreme surprise on this trying Revelation; nor did he think of expostulating in the least on this occasion; when at another time he could be so importunate for the pardon of an inhospitable, murderous, impious, and incestuous city:" Insinuating, that this kind of sacrifice was a thing he had been accustomed to. Now the noble Author observes this, upon the Examiner's, that is, the common, interpretation. And I believe, on that footing, he, or a better writer, would find it difficult to take out the malicious sting of the observation. But I have shewn that it falls together with the common Interpretation.

Well; Abraham is now in the land of Canaan; and again surrounded with the same idolatrous and inhuman Sacrificers. Here he receives the *Command:* And, on the point of execution, has the performance remitted to him as 'a FAVOUR; a circumstance, in the revocation of the *Command*, which I must beg the Examiner's leave to remind him of, especially when I see him, at every turn, much disposed to forget it, that is, to pass it over in silence, without either owning or denying. And, indeed, the little support his reasoning has on any occasion, is only by keeping Truth out of sight. But further, the *favour* was unaccompanied with any instruction concerning the moral nature of this kind of Sacrifice; a practice never positively forbidden but by the Law of Moses. Now, in this case, I would ask any candid Reader, the least acquainted with human nature, whether Abraham and his Family, prejudiced as they were in favour of Human Sacrifices (the one, by his education in his country-Religion; the other, by their communication with their Pagan-neighbours, and, as appears by Scripture, but too apt of themselves, to fall into idolatry) would not be easily tempted to think as favourably of Human Sacrifices as those Pagans were, who understood that Diana required Iphigenia, though she accepted a Hind in her stead. And with such Readers, I finally leave it.

P. 189. BBB. "Where are your Authorities for all this?" (says Dr. Stebbing.) "You produce none. Wherever you had your Greek, I am very sure you had it not from the *New Testament*, where these words are used indiscriminately." [Consid. p. 142, 143.] *Where are your Authorities? you produce none.* This is to insinuate, I had none to produce. He dares not, indeed, say so; and in this I commend his prudence. However,

* Joshua xxiv. 2, 3.

thus far he is positive, that *wherever I had my Greek, I had it not from the New Testament.* The Gentleman is hard to please: Here he is offended that I *had it not;* and, before, that I *had it* from the New Testament. Here I impose upon him; there I trifled with him. But, in all this diversity of acceptance, it is still the same spirit: The spirit of *Answering.*

I had said, the two Greek words, *in their exact use,* signify so and so. Which surely implied an acknowledgment, that this exactness was not always observed; especially by the Writers of the New Testament; who, whatever some may have dreamed, did not pique themselves upon what we call, classical elegance. Now, this implication, our Examiner fairly confirms, though, by way of confutation. *In the New Testament* (says he) *these words are used indiscriminately.* I had plainly insinuated as much; and he had better have let it rest on my acknowledgment; for the instances he brings, to prove the words used indiscriminately in the New Testament, are full enough to persuade the Reader that they are not so used. His first instance is, 1 *Pet.* iv. 13. "*Rejoice* [χαίρετε] *inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed* [χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι] *ye may be glad with exceeding joy.* See you not here" (says he) "the direct reverse of what you say; that χαίρω signifies the joy which arises upon prospect, and ἀγαλλιάομαι that which arises from possession." [Consid. p. 143.] No indeed; I see nothing like it. The followers of Christ are bid to *rejoice,* χαίρετε. For what? *For being partakers of Christ's sufferings.* And was not this a blessing in possession? But it seems our Doctor has but small conception how suffering for a good conscience can be a blessing. Yet at other times he must have thought highly of it, when, in excess of charity, he bespoke the Magistrate's application of it on his Neighbours, under the name of WHOLESOM SEVERITIES. He is just as wide of truth when he tells us, that ἀγαλλιάομαι *signifies the joy which arises on possession.* They are bid to *rejoice* now in sufferings, that they might *be glad with exceeding joy* at Christ's second coming. And is this the being glad for a good in possession? Is it not for a good in prospect? The reward they were then going to receive. For I suppose the appearance of *Christ's glory* will precede the reward of his followers. So that the Reader now sees, he has himself fairly proved for me, the truth of my observation, *That in the exact use of the words,* ἀγαλλιάομαι *signifies that tumultuous pleasure which the certain expectation of an approaching blessing occasions; and* χαίρω *that calm and settled Joy that arises from our knowledge, in the possession of it.*

He goes on. "Rev. xix. 7. *Let us be glad and rejoice* [χαίρωμεν καὶ ἀγαλλιώμεθα]*—for the marriage of the Lamb is come.* Where both words" (says he) "refer to blessings in possession. Again, Matt. v. 12. *Rejoice and be exceeding glad* [χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε] *for great is your reward in Heaven;* where both refer to blessings in prospect." [Consid. p. 143, 144.] His old fortune still pursues him. The first text from the Revelations, *Be glad and rejoice,* FOR *the marriage of the Lamb is come;* bids the followers of Christ now do that, which they were bid to prepare for, in the words of St. Peter, *that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad with exceeding joy.* If, therefore, where they are bid to prepare for their rejoicing, the joy is for a good in prospect (as we have shewn it was) then, certainly, where they are told that this time of rejoicing *is come,* the joy must still be for a good in prospect. And yet he says, *the words refer to blessings in possession.* Again, the text from St. Matthew—*Rejoice and be exceeding glad,* FOR *great is your reward in heaven,* has the same relation to the former part of St. Peter's words [*Rejoice inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings*] as

the text in the Revelation has to the latter. *Blessed are ye* (says Jesus in this gospel) *when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad,* FOR *great is your reward in heaven.* Rejoice! for what? Is it not for the persecutions they suffer for his sake? A *present blessing* sure; though not perhaps to our Author's taste. The reason why they should rejoice, follows, *for great is your reward in heaven.* And yet here, he says, the words *refer to blessings in prospect.* In truth, what led him into all this inverted reasoning, was a pleasant mistake. The one text says—*Be glad and rejoice,* FOR, ὅτι—The other, *Rejoice and be exceeding glad,* FOR, ὅτι —Now he took the particle, in both places, to signify *propter, for the sake of;* whereas it signifies *quoniam, quia,* and is in proof of something going before. So that he read the text—*Rejoice, for the marriage of the Lamb is come;* As if it had been—"Rejoice for the marriage of the Lamb, WHICH is come:" And—*rejoice, for great is your reward in heaven;* as if it had been,—"Rejoice for your great reward in heaven."

But now let us consider these texts in another view, in order to do justice to his delicacy of judgment. I had said that, in the *exact use* of the two Greek words, they signify so and so; and applied that observation to a FACT; where a person was said to have rejoiced, *&c.* In order to disprove this criticism, he brings three passages, in which those Greek words are used, where NO FACT is related; but where men are, in a rhetorical manner, called upon, and bid to rejoice, *&c.* In which latter case, the use of one word for another, is an elegant conversion. Those, in possession of a blessing, are bid to rejoice with that exceeding joy, which men generally have in the certain expectation of one approaching; and those in expectation, with that calm and settled joy, which attends full possession. And who but our Examiner could not see, that the use of words is one thing, in an historical assertion; and quite another, in a rhetorical invocation?

Having thus ably acquitted himself in one criticism, he falls upon another. "What shall we do with ἵνα?"—What indeed! But no sooner said than done, "Ἵνα *(says he)* is often put for ὅτε or ὅτι, positive as you are, that it always refers to a future time." [Consid. p. 144.] Now, so far from being *positive* of this, I am positive of the contrary, that there is not one word of truth in all he says. I observed indeed, that ἵνα ἴδῃ, in the text, *refers only to a future time.* And this I say still, though our translators have rendered it, equivocally, *to see.* Yet he affirms, that I say, "ἵνα [standing alone] always refers to a future time." That I am positive of it, nay very positive, "positive as you are," says he. And to shame me of this evil habit, he proceeds to shew, from several texts, that ἵνα is often put for ὅτε or ὅτι. "Thus John xvi. 2. *The time cometh* THAT [ἵνα] *whosoever killeth you will think he doth God service.* Again: 1 Cor. iv. 3. *With me it is a small thing* THAT [ἵνα] *I should be judged of you.* And nearer to the point yet, 3 John 4. *I have no greater joy* [ἵνα ἀκούω] than THAT I hear, or, than TO *hear that my children walk in the truth.* And why not here, Sir; *Abraham rejoiced* [ἵνα ἴδῃ] WHEN he saw, or THAT he saw, or (which is equivalent) TO SEE my Day." [Consid. p. 144.] For all this kindness, the best acknowledgment I can make, is to return him back his own criticism; only the *Greek* words put into *Latin.* The *Vulgate* has rendered ἵνα ἴδῃ by *ut videret,* which words I will suppose the Translator to say (as without doubt he would) *refer only to a future time.* On which, I will be very learned and critical:—"Positive as you are, Sir, that *ut* always refers to a *future time,* I will shew you that it is sometimes put for *postquam* the *past,*

Ut vidi, ut perii, ut me malus abstulit Error!

and sometimes (which is yet nearer to the point) for *quanto—Ut quisque optimè Græcè sciret, ita esse nequissimum.* And why not here, Sir, *Abraham* rejoiced [*ut videret*] WHEN HE saw, or THAT he saw, or which is equivalent, TO SEE my day?" And now he says, *there is but one difficulty that stands in his way.* And what is this, I pray you? Why, that according to his (Dr. Stebbing's) interpretation, "the latter part of the sentence is a repetition of the former. *Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad;* i. e. *Abraham rejoiced to see, and then saw and rejoiced.* But such kind of repetitions are frequent in the sacred Dialect; and, in my humble opinion, it has an elegance here. *Abraham rejoiced to see,* καὶ εἶδε, καὶ ἐχάρη. HE BOTH SAW AND WAS GLAD." [*Consid.* p. 144, 145.] Before he talked of *repetitions in the sacred Dialect,* and pronounced upon their qualities, he should have known how to distinguish between a *pleonasm* and a *tautology;* the first of which, indeed, is often an *elegance;* the latter, always a blemish in expression: and, in the number of the latter, is this *elegant repetition* of the Doctor's own making. Where a repetition of the same thing is given in different words, it is called a *pleonasm;* when in the same words (as in the Doctor's translation of the text in question) it is a *tautology,* which, being without reason, has neither grace nor *elegance.* Nay the very pretence it has to common sense arises from our being able to understand the equivocal phrase, *to see,* in my meaning, of, *that he might see.* Confine it to the Doctor's, of—*Abraham rejoiced when he had seen my day; and he saw it and was glad,* and the *absurdity* becomes apparent. For the latter part of the sentence beginning with the conjunction completive καὶ, it implies a further predication. Yet in his translation there is none; though he makes an effort towards it, in dropping the sense of καὶ in the sound of BOTH.

P. 190. CCC. Dr. Stebbing tells me, "there is not one word, in the history of the Old Testament, to justify this threefold distinction:" and that I myself CONFESS as much. It is true, I confess that what is not in the Old Testament is not to be found there. And had he been as modest, he would have been content to find a *future state* in the New Testament only. —But where is it, I would ask, that "I confess there is not one word, in the history of the Old Testament, to justify this three-fold distinction?" I was so far from any such thought, that I gave a large epitome * of Abraham's whole history, to shew that it justified this *three-fold distinction,* in every part of it. His manner of proving my confession will clearly detect the fraud and falshood of his charge. For, instead of doing it from my own words, he would argue me into it, from his own inferences. "You confess it" (says he); "FOR you say, that Moses's history begins with the second period, and that the first was wisely omitted by the historian." Let us apply this reasoning to a parallel case. I will suppose him to tell me (for, after this, he may tell me any thing) "that I myself confess there is not one word in the Iliad of Homer, to justify me in saying that there were three periods in the destruction of Troy; the first, the robbery of Helen; the second, the combats before the Walls; and the third, the storming of the Town by the Greeks; FOR that I say, that Homer's poem begins at the second period; wisely omitting the first and the last." Now will any one conclude, from this reasoning, that I had made any such confession?

P. 190. DDD. This shews why GOD might say to *Hosea, Go take unto*

* From p. 175 to 177, of this volume.

thee a wife of whoredoms, &c. chap. i. ver. 2.—Though all actions which have no *moral import* are indifferent; yet some of this kind (which would even be indifferent, had they a moral import) may, on the very account of their having no *moral import*, be the object of pleasure or displeasure. Thus, in the adventure between Elisha and Joash, we are told, that the Prophet said unto the King, "Take bow and arrows; and he took unto him bow and arrows. And he said to the king of Israel, Put thine hand upon the bow; and he put his hand upon it; and Elisha put his hands upon the king's hands. And he said, Open the window eastward; and he opened it. Then Elisha said, Shoot; and he shot. And he said, The arrow of the Lord's deliverance from Syria: for thou shalt smite the Syrians in Aphek, till thou have consumed them. And he said, Take the arrows; and he took them. And he said unto the king of Israel, Smite upon the ground; and he smote thrice and stayed. And the man of God *was wrath with him*, and said, Thou shouldest have smitten five or six times, then hadst thou smitten Syria, till thou hadst consumed them, whereas now thou shalt smite Syria but thrice." 2 Kings xiii. 15—18. Here it is not difficult to apprehend, that the Prophet, by God's command, directed the King to perform a significative action, whose meaning GOD had beforehand explained to his Messenger: and, amongst the particulars of it, had told him this, that the Syrians should be smitten as often as the King smote upon the ground, when the Prophet should order him (only in general words) *to smite* it. Hence the Prophet's anger, occasioned by his love to his country, on the King's stopping when he had *smote thrice*.

P. 190. EEE. To this Dr. Stebbing answers, "I can easily understand, Sir, how the matter stood with Abraham; and that HE was in no danger of being misled, as to the nature of human Sacrifices, who knew the secret of the whole affair; and that it was nothing else but Scenery. But how this answer will serve for *his Family*, who are to be presumed to have known nothing of this scenical representation, is utterly past my comprehension;—because you have told us from the very first, that the information to be conveyed by it was intended for Abraham's SOLE USE; and I do not see how Abraham could open to his family the scenery of the transaction, without explaining the *mystery*.—But is not your putting the *Family* of Abraham, in possession of this consequence, a very plain declaration, that they knew the mystery of Christ's sacrifice? Now therefore, Sir, take your choice, and give up one part of your hypothesis, or the other, as best pleases you; for to hold both is impossible. If you say that the family of Abraham were acquainted with the mystery of Christ's sacrifice; it will overturn all you have said concerning their ignorance of a future state: It likewise overturns the single reason you have given why the explanation (usual in all such cases) to shew the import of the transaction was not added, *viz.* that it was a point *not fit for common knowledge*. But if you shall chuse to say, that the revelation of this mystery was for the SOLE information of Abraham, and that his family knew nothing of it, the objection will lie full against you, unanswered." [Consid. p. 166.]

I had said, that the command was for *Abraham's sole use;* and "therefore" (says the Doctor) "the Family of Abraham must be presumed to know nothing of this scenical representation:" Notwithstanding this, *I presume* (he says) *that they did know it*. Here he takes me in a flagrant contradiction. But did he indeed not apprehend that where I spoke of its being given for *Abraham's sole use*, I was opposing it (as the course of my argument required) not to the single family which THEN lived under his tents, but to the Jewish People, WHEN the history of the transaction was

recorded?—And now having shewn his wrong conclusion from MY words, let us consider next the wrong conclusion he draws from HIS OWN.—*I do not see* (says he) *how Abraham could open to his family the scenery of the transaction without explaining the mystery?* What does he mean by, *opening the scenery of the transaction?* There are two senses of this ambiguous expression; it may signify, either, *explaining the moral of the scenery;* or simply, *telling his family that the transaction was a scenical representation.* He could not use the phrase in the first sense, because he makes *explaining the mystery* a thing different from *opening the scenery.* He must mean it then in the latter. But could not Abraham tell his Family, that this was a *scenical representation* without *explaining the mystery?* I do not know what should hinder him, unless it was the sudden loss of speech. If he had the free use of his tongue, I think, he might, in the transports of his joy, on his return home, tell his Wife, "That God had ordered him to sacrifice his Son, and that he had carried this Son to mount Moriah, in obedience to the divine Command, where a ram was accepted in his stead; but that the whole was a mere scenical representation, to figure out a mysterious transaction which God had ordained to come to pass in the latter ages of the world." And I suppose when he had once told his wife, the Family would soon hear of it. Now could they not understand, what was meant by a *scenical representation*, as well when he told them it was to prefigure a mystery, as if he had told them it was to prefigure the *crucifixion of Jesus?* Had I no other way of avoiding his dilemma (for if I escape his *Contradiction*, he has set his *Dilemma-trap*, which, he says, it is impossible I should escape) had I nothing else, I say, it is very likely I should have insisted upon this explanation: But there are more safe ways than one of taking him by his Horns. "Now therefore" (says he) "take your choice, and give up one part of your hypothesis or the other, as best pleases you; FOR TO HOLD BOTH IS IMPOSSIBLE. If you say that the family of Abraham were acquainted with the Mystery, it will overturn all you said concerning their ignorance of a Future State—But if you shall chuse to say that the revelation of the Mystery was for the sole information of Abraham, and that his Family knew nothing of it, then—the construction in favour of human Sacrifices must have been the very same as if no such representation, as you speak of, had been intended." I desire to know where it is that I have spoken ANY THING *of the ignorance of Abraham's Family, concerning a Future State.* But I am afraid, something is wrong here again: and that, by *Abraham's Family*, he means the *Israelites under Moses's policy:* for, with regard to them, I did indeed say that the gross body of the People were ignorant of a Future State. But then I supposed them equally ignorant of the true import of the Command to Abraham. But, if, by *Abraham's Family*, he means, as every man does, who means honestly, those few of his houshold, I suppose them indeed acquainted with the true import of the Command; but then, at the same time, not ignorant of a Future State. Thus it appears that what our Examiner had pronounced IMPOSSIBLE, was all the while very possible. And in spite of this terrible Dilemma, both parts of the hypothesis are at peace. I can hardly think him so immoral as to have put a designed trick upon his Reader: I rather suppose it to be some confused notion concerning the Popish virtue of TRADITION (that trusty Guardian of Truth) which led him into all this absurdity: and made him conclude, that what Abraham's houshold once knew, the Posterity of Abraham could never forget. Though the WRITTEN WORD tells us, that when Moses was sent to redeem this Posterity from bondage, they remembered so little of God's Revelations to their Fore-fathers, that they

knew nothing even of his NATURE, and therefore did, as men commonly do in the like case, enquire after his NAME.

P. 193. FFF. "To me" (says the noble writer) "it plainly appears, that in the early times of *all* Religions, when nations were yet barbarous and savage, there was ever an aptness or tendency towards the dark part of Superstition, which, amongst many other horrors, produced that of *human Sacrifice*. Something of this nature might possibly be deduced even from Holy Writ."—To this a note refers in the following words—Gen. xxii. 1. and Judg. xi. 30. *These places relating to* Abraham *and* Jephthah *are cited only with respect to the notion which these primitive warriors may be said to have entertained concerning this horrid enormity, so common amongst the inhabitants of the* Palestine *and other neighbouring nations. It appears that even the elder of these* Hebrew *princes was under no extreme surprise on this trying revelation. Nor did he think of expostulating, in the least, on this occasion; when at another time he could be so importunate for the pardon of an inhospitable, murderous, impious, and incestuous city*, Gen. xviii. 23, *&c.* Charact. vol. iii. p. 124.

Dr. Stebbing will needs try his strength with the noble Author of the *Characteristics*. For, whether I quote for approbation or condemnation, it is all one; this active Watchman of the Church militant will let nothing escape him, that he finds in my service; nor leave any thing unpurified that has once passed through my hands. To this passage of the noble Lord he replies, "The cases widely differ. God did not open *precisely* what he intended to do with these wicked cities; only said, Judgment was passed. But what has this to do with Isaac, who did not stand as a sinner before God; but as a Sacrifice, acknowledging God's sovereign dominion. For Abraham to intercede here would have inferred a reluctancy to do homage, which would have destroyed the perfection of his resignation." [Hist. of Abr. pp. 41, 42.] So, Isaac's innocence and his *not standing a sinner before God* when he was doomed to death, makes him a less proper object of Abraham's intercession and compassion, than a devoted City, *inhospitable, murderous, impious, and incestuous*. This is our Doctor's HUMANITY: and a modest petition of the Father of the faithful, like that of the Saviour of the world, *If it be possible, let this cup pass from me, nevertheless not as I will but as thou wilt*, would have *destroyed all the perfection of his resignation*. And this is our Doctor's DIVINITY! Strange! that this Father of Orthodoxy could not see, that what might be done by the divine *Antitype* himself, without *destroying his perfection of resignation*, might likewise be done, without that loss, in behalf of the *Type*. After so fine a specimen of what great things he is able to do against this formidable Enemy of Revelation; what pity is it, he was never set on work by his Superiors, *in a more avowed and open manner!*

P. 197. GGG. This man, not long since, wrote against the Divine Legation under the name of a *Society of Free-thinkers:* by the same kind of figure, I suppose, that He in the Gospel called himself *Legion*, who was only the forwardest Devil of the Crew.

P. 197. HHH. But I mistake. Unbelievers, I think, are not yet quite so shameless. The objection, in form, comes from another quarter. It is Dr. Stebbing, who, for the honour of the Church, makes it for them. He will not allow that the words of Jesus are of any validity to support my interpretation of the *Command* to Abraham, because Unbelievers will not admit the inspiration of the New Testament. But what then? they have not yet disputed with me my interpretation of the *Command*. Nobody hath done this but Dr. Stebbing. And I hope the Authority of Jesus will

stand good against him. He was in haste to do their business for them: and, it must be confessed, by an argument that does equal credit to his logic and his piety.

Fair reasoners of all parties will see, though Dr. Stebbing will not, that the question is not *particular* concerning the *inspiration* of the Old and New Testament; but *general*, of the *connexion* between them; and those will not be so unreasonable to expect I should prove this connexion, of which they ask a proof, any otherwise than by applying each reciprocally to explain and to support the other. If the two Testaments be shewn to do this; while on the other hand, when singly considered, and without each other's mutual assistance, they are inexplicable, the connexion between them is fairly made out. The objection of Unbelievers stands thus. "You pretend" (say they) "that these two Dispensations are two constituent *parts* of God's great moral Œconomy: If this be true, they must needs have a strong connexion and real relation to one another. Shew us this connexion and relation: and amuse us no longer with proving the divinity of this or that Dispensation separately, as if each were independent on the other." I comply with their demand: And now Dr. Stebbing tells me, I take this or that Revelation for granted which I should have proved. Whereas in truth I take nothing for granted but what Unbelievers are ready to prove against me, if I did not: namely, that between two Dispensations, the one pretended to be preparatory to the other, there must needs be a strong and near connexion and relation. And if, in the course of evincing this connexion, I urge some circumstances in the Jewish to support the Christian, and others in the Christian to support the Jewish, this, I suppose, is not *taking for granted* the truth either of one or the other, but *proving* the divinity of both.

P. 201. III. Hence we see the vanity of Mr. Whiston's distinction, who is for retaining *Types* (necessitated thereunto by the express declarations of Holy Writ) and for rejecting *double senses*. "Mr. Whiston" (says the author of *the Grounds, &c.)* "justifies *typical* arguing *from the ritual laws of* Moses, *and from passages of History in the Old Testament.*—Indeed he pretends *this* last to be *quite another thing from the odd* (typical) *application of prophecies.* For" (says he) "the ancient ceremonial institutions were, as to *their principal branches, at least in their own nature,* Types and shadows of future good things—*But the case of the ancient prophecies to be alledged from the old Scriptures for the confirmation of Christianity is quite of another nature, and of a more nice and exact consideration.*" p. 227, 228. It appears, indeed, they are *of a more nice and exact consideration*, even from Mr. Whiston's so much mistaking them, as to suppose they are of *a nature quite different from Types.* But instead of telling us honestly that he knew not what to make of them, he plays the courtier and dismisses them, for *a more nice and exact consideration.*

P. 202. KKK. The Bishop of London, in his *Discourses on the Use and Intent of Prophecy*, seemed to have but a slender idea of this *use* when he wrote as follows—"There was no occasion" (says he) "to lay in so long beforehand the evidence of prophecy, to convince men of things that were to happen in their own times: *and it gives us a low idea of the administration of Providence* in sending Prophets one after another in every age from Adam to Christ, to imagine that all this apparatus was for their sakes who lived IN OR AFTER the times of Christ." p. 37. But such is the way of these Writers who have a favourite doctrine to inforce. The truth of that doctrine (if it happen to be a truth) is supported at the expence of all others. Thus his Lordship, setting himself to prove that *Prophecy was*

given principally to support the Faith and Religion of the World, thought he could not sufficiently secure his point without weakening and discrediting another of, at least, equal importance,—*That it was given to afford testimony to the mission of Jesus.*

P. 205. LLL. This account of Types and secondary senses, which supposes they were intended to conceal the doctrines delivered under them, is so very natural, and, as would seem, reasonable, that Dr. Stebbing himself subscribes to it. And hence occasion has been taken by a most acute and able Writer to expose his prevarication, in maintaining that the Jews had the revealed Doctrine of a Future State: For the Doctor not only confesses that the Doctrine was revealed under Types, but that Doctrines, thus conveyed, were purposely secreted from the knowledge of the ancient Jews. See *the Argument of the Divine Legation fairly stated*, p. 125. And *the free and candid Examination of Bishop Sherlock's Sermons*, &c. chap. ii. where the controversy on this point is fairly determined, as far as truth and reason can determine any thing.

P. 215. MMM. Hear what a very judicious Critic observes of the line in question. "The comment of SERVIUS on this line is remarkable. *Hunc versum notant Critici*, quasi superfluè et inutiliter *additum*, *nec convenientem gravitati ejus*, *namque est magis neotericus*. Mr. ADDISON conceived of it in the same manner when he said *this was the only witty line in the Æneis*; meaning such a line as *Ovid* would have written. We see they esteemed it a wanton play of fancy, unbecoming the dignity of the Writer's work, and the gravity of his character. They took it, in short, for a mere *modern* flourish, totally different from the pure unaffected manner of genuine antiquity. And thus far they unquestionably judged right. Their defect was in not seeing that the *use* of it, as here employed by the Poet, was an exception to the *general rule*. But to have seen this was not, perhaps, to be expected even from these Critics. However from this want of penetration arose a difficulty in determining whether to read *facta* or *fata* nepotum. And as we now understand that *Servius* and his Critics were utter strangers to Virgil's noble idea, it is no wonder they could not resolve it. But the *latter* is the Poet's own word. He considered this shield of celestial make as a kind of *Palladium*, like the ANCILE which fell from Heaven, and used to be carried in procession on the *shoulders* of the SALII. *Quid de scutis* (says Lactantius) *jam vetustate putridis dicam? Quæ cum portant*, DEOS IPSOS SE GESTARE HUMERIS SUIS arbitrantur. [Div. Inst. lib. i. c. 21.] Virgil, in a fine flight of imagination, alludes to this venerable ceremony, comparing, as it were, the shield of his hero to the sacred ANCILE; and, in conformity to the practice in that sacred procession, represents his hero in the priestly office of religion,

Attollens HUMERO *famamque et* FATA *Nepotum.*

This idea then, of the sacred shield, the guard and glory of Rome, and on which, in this *advanced* situation, depended the fame and fortune of his country, the Poet with extreme elegance and sublimity transfers to the shield which guarded their great Progenitor, while he was laying the first foundations of the Roman Empire." *Mr.* HURD—*Notes on the Epistle to Augustus*, p. 68, 69, 3d ed.

P. 220. NNN. The Reader sees however, by this, that he at length takes ALLEGORIES *and* SECONDARY SENSES *not to be the same:* In which, I must crave leave to tell him, he is mistaken; *Religious allegories* (the only allegories in question) being no other than a species of *secondary senses.*

This may be news to our Critic, though he has written and printed so much about ALLEGORIES, that is, about *secondary senses;* as Monsieur Jordan was surprized to find he had talked prose all his life-time, without knowing it.

P. 220. OOO. Dr. Stebbing, of this SOME (by one of his arts of controversy) has made ALL. And charges me * with giving this as the character of *double prophecies* in general, that *without Miracles in their conformation they could hardly have the sense contended for well ascertained.* On the contrary, he assures his reader that no Prophecy can have its sense supported by Miracles.—That part which relates to the Morality of the Doctor's conduct in this matter, I shall leave to himself: with his Logic I have something more to say. The *Miracles*, which the Reader plainly sees I meant, were those worked by Jesus; and the *Prophecies*, some of those which Jesus quoted, as relating to himself. But the Doctor tells us, "That Miracles are not to be taken for granted in our disputes with Unbelievers." In some of our disputes with Unbelievers they are not to be taken for granted; in some they are. When the dispute is, whether the truth of Jesus' *Mission* appear from Miracles, it would be absurd to take Miracles for granted: but when the dispute is, whether the truth of his *Messiah-character* appear from Prophecies, there is no absurdity in taking his Miracles for granted; because an unbeliever may deny his *Messiah-character*, which arises from Prophecies, and yet acknowledge this *Mission* which is proved by Miracles; but he cannot deny the truth of his *mission*, which is proved by Miracles, and yet acknowledge his Miracles. But more than this—An Unbeliever not only *may allow* us to suppose the truth of Miracles when the question is about the proof of the *Messiah-character* from Prophecies; but the Unbeliever, with whom I had here to do, Mr. Collins, does *actually allow* us, in our dispute with him, to suppose the truth of Miracles: For thus he argues, "Jesus, you say, has proved his Mission by Miracles. In good time. But he had another Character to support, that of a *promised Messiah*, for which he appeals to the Prophecies: Now, 1st, these Prophecies relate not to him, but to another. And 2dly, Miracles never can make that relate to him which relates to another." In answer to this, I proposed to shew, that the first proposition was absolutely false, and that the second very much wanted to be qualified. In the course of this dispute, I had occasion to urge the evidence of Miracles; and Mr. Collins, while denying the *Messiah-character*, had permitted me to suppose their truth. Unluckily, the Doctor, who saw nothing of all this, takes what Logicians call the *point assumed*, and the *point to be proved*, for one and the same thing. That Jesus was a *divine Messenger*, and worked Miracles is the point *assumed* by me; and Mr. Collins, over-confident of his cause, permitted me to assume it. That Jesus was the *Messiah* foretold, is the point *to be proved;* and I did not expect that any other than a follower of Mr. Collins would deny I had proved it. But I will be fair even with so unfair an Adversary as Dr. Stebbing, and urge *his cause* with an advantage with which I will suppose he would have urged it himself had he known how. It may be questioned whether it be strictly logical to employ this topic (which Mr. Collins allows us to assume) of Jesus's *divine mission* in order to prove his *Messiahship?* Now all that can be here objected is, that we *assume* one Character, in order to *prove* another, in the same divine Person. And what is there illogical in this? Who ever objected to the force of that reasoning against Lord Bolingbroke, which, from the Attributes of God's *power and wisdom* which his Lordship allowed the Author of the *View of his Philo-*

* See "History of Abraham," p. 61, &c.

sophy to assume, inferred and proved God's *justice and goodness*, which his Lordship denied?

But to satisfy, not the Doctor, but any more reasonable man, I will suppose, it may be asked, "Of what use are Prophecies thus circumstanced, that is to say, such as require the evidence of Miracles to ascertain their sense?" I reply, of very important use; as they open and reveal more clearly the mutual dependency and connexion of the two Dispensations on one another, in many particulars which would otherwise have escaped our notice: And, by this means, strengthen several additional proofs of the *Messiahship* of Jesus, on which the Gospel doctrine of *Redemption* depends. But was there no more in it than this, The rescuing *some* prophecies quoted in the New Testament as relating to Jesus, out of the hands of Unbelievers, who have taken an occasion, from their generality or obscurity, to persuade the people that they relate entirely to another matter; this, I say, would be no less than clearing the truth of the *Messiahship* from inextricable difficulties.—I will now take a final leave of this *Answerer by profession;* an Answerer of such eminence, that he may indeed be called,

Knight of the Shire who represents them all.

But as he displays at parting all the effrontery of his miserable trade, I will just stop to new burnish his complexion.

I had called my Argument a *Demonstration*, which one would think no one who could distinguish *Morals* from *Physics* could mistake, or would venture to misrepresent. Yet hear Dr. Stebbing's last words,—"That Moses was the Legislator of the Jews, and that the Jews were ignorant of a Future State; these facts must be known by history, which spoils you for a Demonstrator at once: For historical evidence goes no further than *probability;* and if this must concur to make up the evidence, it cannot be a *Demonstration:* For Demonstration cannot stand upon probability. The evidence may be good and sufficient, but *Demonstration* it cannot be; *which is always founded upon self-evident truths, and is carried on by a chain or series of the most simple ideas hanging upon each other by a necessary connexion.*" Letter to the Dean of Bristol, p. 9, 10. And was it for this, that this wonderful man hath written half a score Pamphlets against the *Divine Legation*, that he could not find in it the same sort of *Demonstration* which he hath been told may be seen in Euclid?

P. 227. PPP. Nothing can be more simple than the principle here inforced, or more agreeable to the rules of just interpretation, than to suppose, that the *Language of the Law*, in the terms ALTAR, SACRIFICE, &c. is employed to convey these prophetic intimations of the Gospel. The ancient fathers of the Church very improvidently continued the use of these terms, when speaking of the Christian Rites: For though they used them, and professed to use them metaphorically, yet it gave countenance to strange extravagance of Scripture-interpretation amongst the Romanists. The ingenious Author of the *Principes de la foi Chretienne*, Tom. i. p. 273. brings this prophecy of Malachi for a proof of the divine institution of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

P. 233. QQQ. It is wonderful to consider how little the Writers, on either side the question, have understood of the *logical propriety and moral fitness* of Types, and secondary senses of Prophecy.

Dr. Middleton and Dr. Sykes, who agreed with Mr. Collins in laughing at these modes of information, agreed with him likewise, in laying down such principles and inculcating such ideas of the Mosaic Religion, as most effectually tended to evince this *logical propriety and moral fitness.*

On the other hand, Bishop Sherlock, Dr. Stebbing, and other advocates for Types and secondary senses of Prophecy, lay down such principles, and inculcate such ideas of the Mosaic Religion, as would totally supersede the use of these modes of information, and consequently destroy both their *logical propriety and moral fitness*.—See the *Free and candid Examination of Bishop Sherlock's Principles*, &c. chap. ii.

P. 238. RRR. M. BOUILLER, the ingenious Author of the *Court Examen de la Thése de Mr. L'Abbé de* PRADES *et Observations sur son Apologie*, having charged *de Prades* with taking his idea of the Mosaic Œconomy from this Work, without owning it, goes on, in his own way, to shew that the ARGUMENT of *the Divine Legation*, as delivered in these two Volumes, is CONCLUSIVE.—"La Loi Mosaïque, considerée comme fondement d'un etablissement national et temporel, n'avoit que des promesses et des menaces, ne proposoit que des peines, des recompenses, temporelles: aulieu qu'à considerer *les grandes vues de cet etablissement, par rapport à l'Eglise même*, la Loi étoit une espece de tableau emblématique, qui sous l'enveloppe des objets charnels *figuroit les spirituels;* ensorte que, en raisonnant selon les principes d'une juste analogie, la foi des *Israélites éclairés* et pieux, trouvoit dans les promesses de la Loi, *qui portoient uniquement sur les biens presens*, un nouveau garand de la certitude des biens avenir. Mais comme on doit bien se souvenir, que dans cette Nation, les Fideles ne faisoient QUE LE PETIT NOMBRE, *l'argument de* WARBURTON, *tiré du silence de la Loi sur une Œconomie avenir, en faveur de la divinité de cette Loi même, conserve toute sa force;* car il demeure toujours vrai qu'il n'a pas fallu moins que la vertu des MIRACLES et l'efficace d'une impression surnaturelle, pour faire ployer *le gros de la Nation*, c'est à-dire les Juifs charnels, qui ne pénétroient point ces vues Mystérieuses, sous le joug pesant de la Dispensation Mosaïque." [p. 94, 95.] And again, "Ce double Caractere de la Dispensation Mosaïque met sa divinité hors d'atteinte à tous les traits les plus envenimés du Déisme qui l'attaque par deux batteries opposées. Quoi? disent nos Libertins, une Religion qui promet uniquement les biens de la Terre, peut-elle être digne de Dieu! Et lorsque, pour leur répondre, ayant recours au sens mystique, on dit que les promesses Légales qui, prises à la lettre, n'offrent qu'un bonheur temporel, doivent s'entendre spirituellement; ces Messieurs se retournent aussi-tot avec une merveilleuse adresse pour vous demander comment un Oracle, qui trompe les hommes, et qui n'a point d'accomplissement dans le sens le plus clair, le plus propre, et le plus littéral de ce qu'il promet, peut être regardé comme un Oracle divin? Question, qui dans l'hypothese commune me paroit plus difficile à résoudre d'une façon satisfaisante. Mais l'une et l'autre objection tombe, dès qu'on envisage l'ancienne Œconomie telle qu'elle est; c'est-à-dire, tout à la fois comme Alliance nationale et comme Œconomie religieuse. En qualité d'Alliance nationale, ses promesses sont toutes Charnelles, et *s'accomplissent à la lettre* à l'egard des *Juifs*. Mais en qualité d'Œconomie religieuse, *essentiellement liée au plan de l'Evangile*, elle est pour les *Fidéles*, la figure et le gage des biens spirituels. Doublement digne du Dieu de vérité, et par *l'accomplissement litteral de ses promesses*, et par leur usage typique, la réunion de ces deux rapports y annonce l'ouvrage de son infinie sagesse." [*Addition à l'Article* IV. p. 104.]

Thus far this ingenious Writer. But now a difficulty will occur. He owns the Author of *the Divine Legation* hath made out his point, that the Law of Moses is from God: He contends that the Author's system is the *only one* that can support this Revelation against the objections of Deists and Libertines: Yet when he has done this, he has thought fit to call this

very system, a *Paradox;* though it goes upon his own principle, *That the Mosaic Dispensation had a double character; that it was a national Alliance, and was at the same time essentially united to the Gospel plan; that this double Character though not apprehended by the body of the Jewish People, yet was well understood by those peculiarly favoured of God, their Prophets, and Leaders.* This censure, if it be intended for one, I say, appears to me a little mysterious. However, the learned Writer's words are these—"Quand *Mr. de Prades* a dit que l'Œconomie Mosaïque n'étoit fondée que sur les peines et les recompenses temporelles, et qu'il a soutenu que cela même fournit une bonne preuve de la divinité de cette Œconomie, il n'a fait autre chose que suivre la trace du savant *Warburton*, qui avança ce PARADOXE, il y a déjà quelques années, dans son fameux Ouvrage *de la Divine Legation de Moïse*, et employa tour à tour pour le defendre, le raisonnement et l'erudition. Notre Bachelier, aussi-bien que *M. Hooke*, qu'il cite pour son garand, auroient bien dû faire honneur à l'illustre Docteur Anglois, d'une pensée que personne ne doutera qu'ils n'ayent puisée chez lui." [p. 88.] Now, I have so good opinion of this learned Writer's candour as to believe that either he used the word *paradox* in an indifferent sense, or that he was misled in his Judgment of *the Divine Legation* by Mr. de Prades and Mr. Hooke: Who although they borrowed what they have delivered concerning the nature of the Mosaic Œconomy from that book, which they did not think fit to confess, yet it is as certain that what they borrowed they either did not understand, or at least have misrepresented. The learned Sorbonist has since published his course of Theology, intitled *Religionis naturalis et revelatæ Principia.* In which, though he has consulted his ease and perhaps his reputation, in transcribing the reasonings of *the Divine Legation* on various points of Theology, and generally without reference to the Book or the Author; yet his affairs with his Body have taught him caution, and obliged him to declare against the PROPOSITION, in support of which, those reasonings were employed by their original Author. For when he comes to the question concerning *the sanction of the Jewish Law*, he introduces it in the following manner—"Quæstionem inchoamus difficilem, in qua explicanda adhibenda est summa verborum proprietas, ne Pelagianis ex una parte non satis fœdus Mosaicum et Evangelicum discriminantibus, aut contrariis RECENTIORUM QUORUMDAM erroribus favere videamur." And so, fortifies himself with Suarez and St. Thomas. The consequence of which is, that the two large Chapters in his second Volume (the first, To prove that a future state was always a popular Doctrine amongst the Jews; and the second, That temporal rewards and punishments were really and equally distributed amongst them under the Theocracy) just serve to confute one another: Or more properly, the second Chapter, by aid of the Arguments taken from *the Divine Legation*, effectually overturns all that he has advanced in the first.—See M. Hooke's second volume of his Course, intitled, *Religionis naturalis et revelatæ Principia*, from p. 208 to 236. For the rest, this justice is due to the learned and ingenious Writer, that these *Principles of natural and revealed Religion* compose the best reasoned Work in defence of Revelation which we have yet seen come from that quarter.

THE NINTH BOOK

OF

THE DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES:

BEING AN ATTEMPT TO EXPLAIN

THE TRUE NATURE AND GENIUS

OF THE

CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

PRINTED, SO FAR AS IT GOES, BY THE AUTHOR; BUT NEVER BEFORE PUBLISHED, AND LEFT UNFINISHED.

[FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCLXXXVIII.]

THE Reader has been already referred to an Explanation of the omission of Books VII. and VIII.—And lest, in the preceding Title page to the IXth Book, the words "left unfinished" might operate to the prejudice of this division of the work, it may be proper to repeat here a few words from Bishop HURD's introductory *Discourse*:—"This IXth Book is the noblest effort that has hitherto been made to give a RATIONALE OF CHRISTIANITY.... Very little is wanting to complete the Author's design: only what he had proposed to say on the apocalyptic prophecies, and which may be supplied from the *Discourse on Antichrist.*"—See Vol. I. of this Edit. pp. 53, 54.—*Ed.*

INTRODUCTION.*

TRUTH, the great Object of all honest as well as rational Inquiries, had been long sought for in vain; when, the Search now become desperate, after the fruitless toil of the best qualified Sages, and of the most improved times, She suddenly appeared in PERSON to put these benighted Wanderers in their Way. I AM THE TRUTH, says the Saviour of the World. This was his Moral Nature; of more concern for us to know, than his Physical; and, on that account, explained more at large in his *eternal Gospel*.

This last book, therefore, being an attempt to explain the true NATURE AND GENIUS OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION; I shall,

1. First of all, previously examine those sceptical Objections, which, in the long absence of Truth, the World had begun to entertain of her very Being and existence; or at least, of our capacity to discover, and get hold of her. And these being removed,

2. I shall, in the second place, lay down, under what laws, and with what disposition of mind, I have ventured to use the aids of REASON to explain the TRUTHS OF REVELATION.

3. And, lastly, I shall attempt to remove the Prejudices which may arise against any new discoveries in support of REVELATION, which the method here employed to analyze that capital *truth* of all, THE FAITH, may possibly enable us to make.

I.

That ancient Remedy against Error, a *Pyrrhonian*, or, if you like it better, an *Academic* SCEPTICISM, only added one more disorder to the human Mind; but being the last of its misbegotten issue, it became, as is usual, the favorite of its Parent.

Our blessed MASTER himself was the first to encounter its attacks, and the insolence of that School has kept the Church in breath ever since.

When Jesus was carried before Pilate as a Criminal of State, for calling himself *King of the Jews*, he tried to shorten the intended process by pleading that *his Kingdom was not of this World*. But Pilate, alarmed at the names of *King* and *Kingdom*, asked, *art thou a King then?* The other replied,—*For this cause came I into the*

* See "Sermon," concerning *The Nature and Condition of Truth*.—R. W.

World, that I should bear Witness unto the TRUTH. *Pilate saith unto him,* WHAT IS TRUTH? *And when he had said this, he went out again.** For when he found that the *Kingdom* claimed by the supposed Criminal, was a *Kingdom* merely *Spiritual*, or, in the Roman Governor's conceit, a *Kingdom* only in idea, he considered the Claim as no proper subject of the civil tribunal. So far he acted well, and suitably to his public Character. But when he discovered his indifference to, or rather contempt of, TRUTH, when offered to be laid before him as a private Man, by one who, he knew, had the repute of exercising every superior Power proper to enforce it, he appears, to me, in a light much less excusable.

The negligent air of his insulting question will hardly admit of an Apology.—"You tell me" (says he) "of TRUTH, a word in the mouth of every Leader and Follower of a SECT; who all agree (though in nothing else) to give that name to their own Opinions: While TRUTH, if, indeed, we allow of its Existence, still wanders at large, and in disguise. Nor does the Detection seem worth the Pains of the Search, since those things which Nature intended for general use she made plain and obvious, and within the reach of all men."

Sentiments like these bespoke the Ruler of an Asiatic Province, who had heard so much of TRUTH in the Schools of Philosophy; and had heard of it to so little purpose. This corrupt Governor, therefore, finding a Jewish Sage talk of *bearing Witness to the Truth*, (the affected Office of the Grecian Sophists), was ready to conclude that Jesus was one of their mimic Followers. For it was now become fashionable amongst the learned Rabbins to inlist themselves into one or other of those celebrated Schools. Thus the famous Philo was an outrageous PLATONIST: And Jesus calling himself a KING, together with the known Purity and Severity of his Morals, probably made Pilate consider him as one of the STOICAL *wise men*, who alone was free, and happy, and a *King*.

"Liber, honoratus, pulcher, REX denique Regum."

Now, as on the one hand, the Character of the Greek Philosophy, which was of an abstract nature, and sequestered from civil business, made Pilate conclude, that these Claims of Jesus had nothing in them dangerous or alarming; so, on the other hand, its endless disputes and quarrels about TRUTH, and which of the Sects had her in keeping, made Men of the World, and especially those in public Stations, whose practice declined the test of any moral System whatsoever, willing to be persuaded, and ready to conclude, that this boasted TRUTH, which pretended to be the sole Directress of human conduct, was indeed no better than a shifting and fantastic Vision.

* John xviii. 38.

This, I presume, was the light in which Pilate considered the SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD. Had he suspected Jesus of being the Founder of a public and a popular Religion, which aimed to be erected on the ruins of the established Worship, the jealousies of the Roman Court, since the loss of public liberty, had, doubtless, made this servile Minister of Power very attentive, and even officious, to suppress it in its birth.

But if the ill usage of TRUTH by the Philosophers could so disgust the Politician of old, as to indispose him to an acquaintance of this importance, what must we think will be her reception amongst modern Statesmen, whose views are neither more pure nor more generous; and whose penetration, perhaps, does not go much beyond the busy Men of Antiquity; when they see her so freely handled by those, amongst us, who call themselves her Ministers, and profess to consecrate her to the Service of Religion? Amongst such, I mean of the active no less than of the idle part of the fashionable World, Pilate's scornful question is become proverbial, when they would insinuate, that TRUTH, like *Virtue*, is nothing but a *name*.

What is this TRUTH, say they, of which the world has heard so much, and has received so little satisfaction? But above all, what is that GOSPEL TRUTH, the pretended Guide of life, which its Ministers are wont so much to discredit in their very attempts to recommend? For while *objections* to Religion lie level to the capacities of the Vulgar, the *solution* of them requires the utmost stretch of parts and learning in the Teacher to excogitate, and equal application and attention in the Learner to comprehend. From which (say they) we are naturally led to conclude, that the *Gospel doctrines* are no Truths, or at least, Truths of no general concern; since they are neither uniformly held by those who are employed to teach them, nor subject to the examination of such as are enjoined to receive them.

Something like this, I apprehend, may be the way of thinking, and talking too, amongst those who have more decently discarded all care and concern about the Things of Religion.

And as our acquired passions and appetites have concurred with the constitutional weakness of our nature to form these conclusions against TRUTH, and especially against that best part of it, RELIGIOUS TRUTH, Charity seems to call upon us to detect and lay open the general causes which have given birth to Men's prejudices against it.

I. And first, with regard to TRUTH in general;—of the various hindrances to its discovery, and of Men's backwardness to acquiesce in it, when luckily found.

The first and surest Means of acquiring the good we seek, is our love and affection for the object. This quickens our industry, and sharpens our attention. On this account the LOVE OF TRUTH hath

always been recommended by the Masters of Wisdom as the best means of succeeding in the pursuit of it. Hardly any one suspects that he wants this Love: yet there are few whom their confidence does not deceive. We mistake the love of our *Opinions* for the *love of Truth;* because we suppose our own Opinions, *true:* Yet, for the most part, we received them upon trust; and consequently, they are much more likely to be false: So that our affections being now misplaced, they are a greater hindrance in the pursuit of TRUTH, than if we had no affections at all concerning it.

How then shall we know when we have this love? for still it is necessary we should have it, if we would search after TRUTH to any good purpose. It is difficult to describe what every man must feel for himself; and yet it is as dangerous to trust our own feelings, when the Object is so easily mistaken. However, when we set out in pursuit of TRUTH as of a Stranger; and not in Search of Arguments to support our Acquaintance with pre-conceived Opinions: When we possess ourselves in a perfect indifference for every thing but known and well-attested TRUTH; regardless of the place from whence it comes, or of that to which it seems to be going: When the Mind, I say, is in this State, no one, I think, can fairly suspect the reality of its attachment.

1. But our APPETITES rarely suffer us to observe this strict and rigid conduct. We seek the gratification of our humour even in the Laws which should correct it. Hence so many various SYSTEMS OF MORALITY to suit every man's bent of Mind and frame of Constitution. The Indolent, the Active, the Sanguine, the Flegmatic, and the Saturnine, have all their correspondent Theories. And from thenceforth, the concern of each is not the *trial*, but the *support* of his Opinions; which can be no otherwise provided for than by keeping the arguments in favour of them always in view, and by contriving to have those of a less benign aspect overlooked or forgotten.

2. PREJUDICES mislead the Enquirer no less than his *passions*. He venerates the notions he received from his Forefathers: He rests in them on the authority of those whose judgement he esteems; or, at least, wishes well to them for the sake of the honours or profits he sees attached to the profession of them. Nay, he can persuade himself to patronize what he hath once chosen, for reasons with which TRUTH has no manner of concern. He likes them because they are *old;* because they are *new;* for being *plain and simple;* for being *sublime and mysterious;* for being followed by the *Few;* for being followed by the *Many:* in a word, on a thousand other accounts still more remote from the conclusions of common sense.

But then, bad as this is, since it is, at the same time, apparent, that the impediments in pursuit of TRUTH are not *essential*, but only

accidental to the Inquiry, we may well account for our mistakes in setting out; for the slowness of our progress; and the rubs and oppositions we meet in our passage, without having recourse to any *sceptical* conclusions in favour of the incomprehensible *nature* of TRUTH, or the inaccessible *situation* in which the Author of all things hath been pleased to place her. For, is it any reason, that because some Truths are so deep that our haste and impatience will not allow us time to sound them; others so disguised that our dissipation will not enable us to unmask their pretences; and others again, so unfriendly to our prejudices as to indispose us to examine them: That, because some errors wear so plausible a face as to look like TRUTH; others, so commodious an appearance as to be readily received for TRUTH; and others again, so fashionable as to claim all the privileges due to TRUTH; is, I say, all, or any thing of this, a reason for sober men to conclude, that either there is no difference between *Truth* and *Falsehood;* or that the *difference* is so insensible that it will not serve us for a *distinction?* Our Senses, in many cases; our Reason, in more; and our very Hearts in almost all, will tell us the contrary.

II. Secondly, with regard to RELIGIOUS TRUTH. 1. Mistaken constancy, or more tenacious ZEAL, make some men prejudiced in favour of *less allowed* Opinions: And the obliquer affections of avarice or ambition make others declare for such as are *established*. OPPOSITION likewise will too much dispose Both, to support what they may even suspect to be false, and to secrete what they know to be true. This draws them still further from the road of TRUTH; while all they seek is to be at distance from one another's Parties and Opinions.

2. Inveterate errors, long since sanctified by Time and Authority, concerning the nature and end of SCRIPTURE, are another occasion of the disgraces to which *Revelation* is become subject.

GOD'S WRITTEN WORD is so commonly and so justly honoured with the name of THE TRUTH; and holy Writ in general so frequently recommended for its virtue in *leading us into all Truth*, that simple, well-meaning men have been apt to regard it as a Treasury of Science; and to apply to it for all the principles of human knowledge. How wretchedly, for instance, hath the Mosaic account of the Creation been dishonoured, by the wild and fanciful expositions of men besotted by this or that Sect of heathen PHILOSOPHY, or of Christian MYSTICISM! Platonists, Materialists, Cartesians, Chymists, Cabalists, and all the impure Fry of Physical, Philological, and Spiritual Enthusiasts, have found each his own whimsies realised in the first and second chapters of the Book of Genesis.

Again, how impiously have the JEWISH LAW and the GOSPEL OF

JESUS been abused by Slaves and Sycophants, to find, in one, the DIVINE RIGHT of KINGS; and, in the other, the SUPREME DOMINION OF THE CHURCH.

But amidst all this folly and mischief, arising from a perversion of the BIBLE, to support human Systems of Philosophy and Politics, had men only reflected, that though the Bible tells us, it was *written to make men wise*—it addeth—*unto salvation*,* they would have sought for the Principles of *natural* and *civil* knowledge amongst their proper Professors; and have studied Scripture only to investigate that WISDOM *which is from above, and is first* PURE, then PEACEABLE.† A *wisdom* which, at the same time that it rectifies the understanding, purifies the heart; and so removes all ground of contention raised by a perplexed head or a heated temper.

The first Propagators of our holy FAITH, under the immediate Commission of their Master, were, in this, as in all other parts of their conduct, truly admirable. What they chiefly proposed to the People at large, was the BELIEF of a few clear and simple propositions, as *necessary to Salvation:* When they addressed themselves to those chosen Particulars, who were fitly qualified and rightly disposed, they as warmly recommend EXAMINATION:—to *Search the Scriptures*,‡ and *to try all things*.

Yet the only use a late Writer § could find in so sage and generous a conduct, was to abuse it, in a prophane piece of drollery, under the form of a serious question, *Whether Christianity was founded in Argument or in Faith?* which, however designed for Wit, was just as wise as, *Whether* St. Paul's Clock was constructed on MECHANISM or on MOTION? Since, if the Clock was seen to have *motion*, we could not but conclude that the *motion* arose from *mechanism*. So, if the vital principle of Christianity be FAITH, it can be no other than such a *Faith* as stands upon *Reason*, and is supported by *Argument*. A wild Indian, perhaps, might fancy that St. Paul's Clock was animated, and put in motion by a Spirit: And an Enthusiast, still wilder than the Savage, may say that *Faith is but the Seal of a supernatural impression*. Yet surely, none but a Fool of the *old* stamp, or a Fanatic of the *new*, would be willing to discard REASON, in pursuit of his *future* happiness, when he has already found IT so useful in procuring his *present*. For both present and future Good are, alike, acquired by the proper adaption of *means* to *ends*. An operation which, all must confess, the Aid of REASON only can effectually perform. Nor hath this faithful Guide of life ever afforded cause of complaint or jealousy. When men, who profess to be under HER guidance, find themselves bewildered, they should suspect, not HER, but themselves. And, on a fair examination, I suppose, they will always find, that they

* 2 Tim. iii. 15. † James iii. 17. ‡ John v. 39. § DODWELL.

have been *directing* REASON when they should have been *directed* by HER. But the wayward Affections which occasion her discredit, go on in their illusions to excite our distrust.

II.

Thus much for SCEPTICISM, that bane of human Science, which, while it boasts to be the NERVES OF THE MIND,* deprives it of all its force and vigour. I now proceed to consider the temper and disposition necessary to be acquired by us, before we can safely and profitably employ the AIDS OF REASON to explain the TRUTHS OF REVELATION.

The greatest impediment to Men's advancement in the knowledge of the nature and genius of the CHRISTIAN RELIGION hath ever been their adopting or espousing some favorite HYPOTHESIS, whereon to erect the *Gospel System*. For every dispensation of true Religion, consisting of *means and end*, the well-adapting these to each other, produceth what we call a SYSTEM.

Now this may be built either on an HYPOTHESIS, which is a *supposed* truth, or on a FACT, which is a *real* one. And the Systems of Theology have, for the most part, been unwarily framed on the former model; which, as we say, have much entangled and perplexed our searches after Truth.

Into this mistake men easily fell by injudiciously applying, to the SYSTEM OF GRACE, the method which Philosophers invented, when they set upon explaining the SYSTEM OF NATURE.

They did not consider that any plausible Hypothesis in Physics hath its use, as it serves to shew from what Laws the Natural Phænomena *may* arise. Nor is it destitute of more particular uses; thus the *Ptolemaic Hypothesis* enables Astronomers to predict Eclipses as well as the *Copernican Theory*.

But a mere Hypothesis, to explain *the Dispensation of Grace*, is not only useless, but often, hurtful.

The reason is apparent. It is agreed by all sober and intelligent Naturalists, that God is the Author of the *Material System*: But it is the great question in debate between Religionists and Unbelievers, Whether God be indeed the Author of the *System of Grace*.

At worst, therefore, a false Hypothesis in Physics only keeps hid, or leaves unexplained, the chief beauties of the *Material Creation*: And the disgrace, to which this Method is subject, falls only upon the successless Inquirer; because every such false or fanciful Hypothesis carries along with it, even in the very arguments for its support, the Conviction of its falsehood. But a groundless Hypothesis, in *religious* matters, by affording (and it can afford no other) an unfavour-

* Ἄρθρα ταῦτα τῶν φρενῶν.—EPICHARMUS.

able representation of the moral Attributes of God (his *Goodness* and his *Justice)* becomes a fatal discredit to the Doctrine of *Redemption.*

Yet, at the same time, it is but *just* to observe, that such is the fate and condition of sublunary things, that these sometimes exchange their proper qualities, and produce effects not correspondent to their respective natures.

Thus, in the case as thus considered, we have shewn how harmless a mere hypothesis in Physics generally is, and, on the contrary, how one in Religion is as generally pernicious. Yet sometimes we shall find the *Physical* Hypothesis to be hurtful, and the *Religious* useful.

The *Ptolemaic* System, by destroying all that simplicity of *motion* to be expected in these Works of God, hath, along with its civil and practical use, occasioned a speculative mischief; and inclined men to Atheism; as appears in the case of Alphonsus, who impiously boasted, that, had he been consulted about the Solar System, he could have advised how it might have been better constructed. I call it an *impious* boast, because it plainly insinuated, that he (who had discovered the imperfections of the Ptolemaic Construction, and was ignorant of the true) ascribed the whole to a *blind and unintelligent Cause.* Again, the *Cartesian,* with his Corpuscularian Hypothesis, attempts to explain all the Phænomena of Nature by *matter and motion;* requiring only that God should at first create a sufficient quantity of each, just enough to set him on work, and then pretends to do the business without his further aid; that is, without the concourse of any VITAL PRINCIPLE to help him forward, in an immaterial way; this *Hypothesis,* I say, which, on the one hand, so much contributed to free Philosophy from the nonsense and tyranny of the SCHOOLS, yet, on the other, produced (while it was in vogue) many rank and irreligious *Materialists.*

But once more turn the tables, and then, so shifting is this state of things, we shall see, although we have shewn that, in the heights and purer regions of Theology, a *mere hypothesis* is likely to disturb and perplex our views, yet there is an inferior Station in that service, where the Divine may employ this counterfeit of a true Theory to very good purpose; in discrediting such objections to Revelation as have gained credit by our imperfect ideas of the true System of the *intellectual World.* Here a probable hypothesis is of use, as it may serve to convince objectors, that what we find recorded in Sacred Scripture of the Origin and Progress of God's extraordinary Dispensation to Man, may be very consistent with what human Reason teacheth of the divine Essence and Attributes. And the more we can frame of those probable Solutions, the more support we give to *Revelation,* though it be only by arguments *ad ignorantiam.*

Notwithstanding all this, it appears, upon the whole, that a suc-

cessful Search after Religious Truths can be then only expected when we erect our System upon FACT; acknowledged *Facts*, as they are recorded in Sacred Scripture.

For if the Dispensation, to which such Facts belong, be indeed from God, all the Parts of it will be seen to be the correspondent Members of one entire WHOLE; which orderly disposition of things, essential to a religious SYSTEM, will assure us of the TRUE THEORY of the Christian Faith.

But the *abuse of Words*, confounding those of HYPOTHESIS and SYSTEM with one another (the word *System* being a common term, which may be applied equally to an *Hypothesis* or a *true Theory)* hath thrown a discredit on the latter, with which the former only is chargeable. Examples of this the attentive Reader may find among the numberless Cavils to the Work of *The Divine Legation.*

Hitherto we have endeavoured to shew in what way HUMAN REASON should be employed on religious matters.

But then, how far, when thus employed, She is to be *indulged*, is the next thing to be considered.

The three moral Attributes of the Godhead, discoverable by natural Light, on which men are accustomed to examine the pretensions of *Revelation*, are his JUSTICE, his GOODNESS, and his WISDOM. But the Reasoner on Religion will trangress his bounds, unless he confine himself within the *two first*. The evidence of this assertion is convincing.

To form a right judgement of the divine Attributes of JUSTICE and GOODNESS, the only *relations*, to be taken into consideration, are those of GOD and MAN. But to judge truly of the WISDOM of the Godhead, other *relations* besides those of God and Man, namely, the whole order of intellectual Beings, dispersed throughout the universe, are to be added to the account: Of whom, further than of their mere existence, we know nothing.

From hence it is seen, that we may safely determine, whether any thing in REVELATION contradict God's JUSTICE and GOODNESS. If it doth, such Revelation is to be rejected. Not so, with regard to his WISDOM, therein manifested in any particular instance; although our natural knowledge of the Being and Attributes of God assures us, that the GREAT ALL is conducted with the most consummate *Wisdom.*

REVELATION therefore is not to be rejected on account of difficulties arising from our ignorance of *all the relations* necessary to be taken in, when we would attempt to form a complete judgment of the exertion of the *Attribute of Wisdom.*

Why this precise mode of REDEMPTION *by the death and sufferings of Christ* was preferred to all other, in the eternal purpose of the Godhead, exceeds the powers of human reason to discover; because

his Attribute of WISDOM, which is out of the reach of man to apply to this inquiry, is here concerned. But when it hath been proved by *Fact*, that a Religion was revealed in which *this mode of Redemption* is employed, then Reason may lend her modest aid to shew (what a *rational Religion* seems to expect should be shewn) that *this precise mode* is conformable to all our ideas of divine *goodness* and *justice*: Nay, that it best quadrates with, as it is seen to be the properest means of, a RESTORATION TO A FREE GIFT, WHEN BECOME FORFEITED.

This difference, in the Application of Reason to religious matters, MOSES hath not obscurely intimated to his People; where, in his last direction for their conduct, he says, *The* SECRET THINGS *belong unto the* LORD *our* GOD; *but those things which are* REVEALED *belong to* US *and to* OUR CHILDREN, *for ever*;* and had I not observed this sage direction, but vainly endeavoured to explain Mysteries which the Gospel hath left unexplained, I should justly have incurred the Censure of Jerom to his Adversaries. *Why* (says this *Father*) *do you pretend, after so many ages are elapsed, to teach us what was never taught before! Why, attempt to* EXPLAIN *what neither* PETER *nor* PAUL *thought it necessary to be known?* †

1. The Principles, here laid down, may be of use, First, to direct future Enquirers in the RIGHT WAY; where, if, on other accounts, they make but slow advances, they are, at least, kept from wandering in the dark. For while the bounds of *Reason* continue unsettled, and the use and abuse of this noble instrument of Truth remain confounded with one another, the very ablest Seeker will be embarrassed and misled.‡ Hence it hath come to pass, that this first and necessary step in support of our holy Faith, AN INQUIRY INTO THE TRUE NATURE AND GENIUS OF THE GOSPEL-DISPENSATIONS, hath been so generally overlooked: instead of which a thousand metaphysical subtilties on the *terms* and *phrases* under which the doctrine of SAVING GRACE is conveyed, have engaged men's principal attention; while the thing itself, a matter of the utmost importance, hath been suffered to lie in all the Obscurity in which old Polemics had involved it. So true hath our perverse nature ever been to itself. "Hoc habet ingenium humanum," (says the great Philosopher) "ut cum ad SOLIDA non sufficiat, in SUPERVACANEIS se atterat." §

2. Another use of these Principles is to convince Unbelievers, that REVEALED RELIGION affords, and is productive of, all the evidence which the nature of the thing requires; and consequently, all which right reason can expect: And that the strongest of their objections to it arise from the abusive exercise of our Faculties, employed on objects which those Faculties can neither apprehend nor reach.

* Deut. xxix. 29. † *Ad Pammachium et Oceanum de erroribus Origenis.*
‡ LIMBORCH'S *Amica Collatio cum erudito Judæo.* § BACON.

III.

But now, all PARTIES, in support of their oblique interest, have concurred to decry *this method of Inquiry:* whereby, from the various genius, the comparative excellence, the mutual dependence, the reciprocal illustration of the several parts of God's moral Dispensation to Mankind, and the gradual progress of the Whole towards perfection, great discoveries have been made in these latter times, by men who dared to break the barrier, which Bigotry and Superstition had been so long forming, to obstruct our views both of NATURE and of GRACE.

These PARTIES ask, How it happened that *Discoveries* so sublime and useful, as is pretended, were *now* to make; when the *light of the spirit* was sent so early, and had illuminated the Church so long?—How it happened, that these Truths were denied to the best times, and, after lying hid for many ages, were reserved for the reward of the very worst? And then, in their real or pretended reverence for *Establishments*, concur in condemning all EXPERIMENTS IN RELIGION.

To these, under their sad suspicions of the issue, in forsaking the OLD POSTURE OF DEFENCE, it will be sufficient to reply,

1. That the promise and gift of the *Holy Spirit* may be considered, either as they referred to the first Propagators of the Faith, or as they concerned the Teachers of it, ever since.

As to the first Propagators, there is no doubt of their being abundantly enlightened for the work of their Ministry; whether it was in making Converts, in founding Churches, or in composing those occasional instructions, by which the Faithful, in all ages, may improve the current benefits of the same Spirit. As to the succeeding Teachers of the word, the assistance they receive from the HOLY SPIRIT, is the second point we are more particularly to consider.

Now the endowment of GRACE is, in this respect, pretty much the same with the endowment of NATURE; of little advantage to the receiver without his co-operation. God hath bestowed upon us hands and feet, to procure good, and to avert evil; but it is to the careful and habitual application of these members to their proper uses, that we owe all the benefits they are capable of producing. So it is with the free gift of the *Spirit*. It is bestowed upon us, to enlighten the understanding, and to redress the disorders of the Will. But it does not work like a *Charm:* for if either we *neglect to employ* these given powers, or *will divert* them to improper subjects, the use and efficacy of *Grace* must certainly be defeated.

This Ordinance, in the œconomy of GRACE, may receive credit from what is seen to have happened in the œconomy of NATURE. The power, wisdom, and goodness of the Almighty is so evident and convincing, from every obvious configuration of matter surrounding us, that these Attributes cannot escape the most inattentive, or lie

concealed from the most short-sighted. Hence a GOD, the Maker, the Preserver, and Governor of the World, is the universal voice of Nature.

Now CREATION and GOVERNMENT, from whence the *morality* of human Actions is deduced, are the foundation of NATURAL RELIGION: so that GOD cannot be said to have been wanting in the discovery of himself to the lowest of his rational Creatures: Yet, though the general and obvious marks of his *power*, *wisdom*, and *goodness*, obtrude themselves upon all men, it is nevertheless certain that a well-directed study of the Book of Nature opens to us such stupendous wonders of his *Power*, such awful Scenes of his *Wisdom*, and such enchanting prospects of his *Goodness*, as far exceed all conception of the unlearned and uninstructed Beholder. Some faint taste of these delights the more inquisitive enjoyed very early: But those who came after, by indulging too much to abstract SPECULATION, and trusting too little to EXPERIMENT, instead of discovering a *real world*, the Archetype of its Maker, invented a variety of *imaginary* ones, all as dishonourable, as they were unrelated to him. At length, two of our own countrymen of superior genius chalked out a different road to the study of Nature, in which vague conjecture was excluded; and *facts*, verified, on *experiments*, were allowed to be the only inlet to physical knowledge. Henceforth, NATURE was set before us, unveiled; and her Sacred Mysteries held out to the knowledge and admiration of all men.

This was the progress in the ways of NATURE: The ways of GRACE ran the very same fortune.

The great Principles of *revealed Religion* are FAITH and OBEDIENCE. These, which are alone sufficient *to make men wise unto Salvation*, are clearly and fully taught in the *Gospel*. But we should greatly derogate from God's *moral Government*, did we not allow it to abound in the like sublime Wonders with the *Natural*. And to the study of the first, there are more important Calls, and much greater Advantages. The knowledge of God's *moral Government*, as far as concerns his religious Dispensations, is the duty of every man: and indeed, the whole business of the Ministers of his *revealed word*. So that partly, for the use and importance of the subject, partly, for the necessity of making head against the enemies of Revelation, but chiefly in obedience to the Command, TO STUDY THE SCRIPTURES, it hath, from the first ages of the Church to the present times, been one of the principal occupations of the Learned. Yet what, from unfavourable circumstances in the *civil* and *literary* world; what, from the varying bias of occasional prejudices; but, above all, from the sordid interests and blind passions of men occupied in these Inquiries; the various Schemes of Religion, pretended to be found in *Scripture*, but indeed, the workmanship of *Divines*, had dishonoured the Doctrine of REDEMPTION near as much as the hypotheses of *Philosophers* had

dishonoured the History of the CREATION. Till here again, as in the former case, the same caution and sobriety which directed men to the true method of treating *things material*, by a careful study of the volume of NATURE, led them into the right way of explaining *things spiritual*, by a careful study of the volume of GRACE. So that if, in these times, the advances in the knowledge of God's WILL should haply prove as considerable as those in the discovery of his WORKS, it will not be beside a reasonable expectation; as similar causes are wont to produce similar effects.

I have placed these correspondent accounts of the progress of the human faculties, in NATURE and in GRACE, in this neighbourly position, that the Reader, by setting them together, and comparing them with one another, may see, whether there be any Objections to NEW DISCOVERIES in *Religion*, which do not equally hold against NEW DISCOVERIES in *Nature*; of which, for their *newness* alone, no one ever yet entertained the least doubt or suspicion of their TRUTH.

For let us compare the Almighty's *display of his nature* in the great Volume of his WORKS, with *the declaration of his Will* in the lesser Volume of his WORD, and we shall find the same marks of GOODNESS to be alike conspicuous in both cases.

In his *Works*, a man need but open his Eyes to see, in every Object, the God which claims his adoration: In his *Word*, the Man who *runs, may read*, the Means and Method of his own Salvation. In neither case, is any thing wanting to instruct the most simple in their dependence and their duty; in which, consists their *happiness*. —For further information in the works and ways of Providence, God wisely reserved it for the reward of the manly and virtuous improvement of the human faculties.

It is true in fact, as hath been already intimated, that throughout a long series of Ages, neither of these Inquirers made any very considerable Advances in REAL KNOWLEDGE. But it is as true, that what hindered Both, proceeded not so much from difficulties in the things sought after, as from the wrong Methods employed in the search. For, instead of addressing themselves to discover the *true Constitution* of Things from the Frame of God's works, as objected to their Senses; or the *true End* of Revelation from Sacred Scripture, as it there lies open to their Contemplation, they framed fanciful hypotheses, out of their own slender stock of ideas; and then, by distorting Nature, and wresting the Bible awry, they forced both one and the other, to Father their blind and spurious Issue.

But when once DIVINES and PHILOSOPHERS were become sensible of their wrong Courses; and, in consequence of that conviction, had measured back their steps; and with more modesty and better sense had renounced their fancies, and erected Theories on the real constitu-

tion of things; it is wonderful to conceive what discoveries were soon made in *Natural* and *Religious* Truths.

THESE TWO IMPORTANT STUDIES, therefore, being alike circumstanced, and having run the same fortune, demand, in all reasonable allowance, the same judgment to be passed on their pretences.

But Men are not accustomed to be thus equitable. One of the readiest, as well as most impudent exploits of Prejudice, is to draw *unlike* conclusions from *similar* Premisses.

It is confessed, that the book of Nature is so plain and clear, that every sentence reveals and proclaims its Almighty Author: that if its more sublime or more profound truths have lain concealed, or been kept out of sight, for Ages, it was the fault of the Inquirers, who adhered so long to a perverse method of studying Nature: for that, as soon as ever they began to seek a better, and to prosecute it with care and sobriety, KNOWLEDGE suddenly opened and enlarged its Empire; while the blaze of light which accompanied its progress, was so far from making Truth suspected for the newness of its Splendour, that it dissipated all those doubts which had been entertained of its obscure nature, and equivocal Claims and Prerogatives.

But now, if we turn from the *Physical* to the *Moral* state of things, we shall find, Men have drawn different inferences from similar cases. —Because, in their search after the higher Truths of Religion, they had been long unsuccessful, they not only took umbrage at these now found, and, like some jewels, found too by their own surrounding light, but conceived fresh doubts even of the most obvious principles which led to these late discoveries.

2. There is, yet, another sort of Believers (and this brings me to the second part of the Objection) who, from too great a reverence for things established, join with such as have too little, in decrying all NOVELTIES in religious Matters. These men, in abhorrence of the Vanity of being wiser than their Fathers, have, in express terms, denounced their displeasure against MAKING, what they call, EXPERIMENTS IN RELIGION.

This is strange language in a Country of Liberty; and stranger still, in an Age of Reason. DIVINES, it is true, have long disputed *how experiments in Religion should be made!* Some would depend on *Scripture* alone; others were for taking in, *Fathers and Councils;* a third sort, for adding *Tradition* to the process; and a fourth, for applying *raillery and ridicule* to quicken the operation. So that, ever since the fall of Monkery, all were for *making some Experiment or other.* For what is *making* sober *experiments,* but (as hath been shewn) supporting and illustrating REVELATION by new arguments, furnished by new *Discoveries* made in the Order, Fitness, and Harmony of God's various Dispensations of Religion amongst themselves, and

with one another; just as PHILOSOPHERS (from whom the Word is borrowed, and we see how unluckily) unfold nature by new discoveries, made from repeated trials on the obvious qualities and hidden Contents of Material Substances.

No experiments in Religion is indeed the civil cant of POLITICIANS; for *Bigotry* and *State-craft* often meet; as extremes easily run into one another by the very attempt to keep them at a distance. This, as I say, is one of the fundamental Articles of the Statesman's Creed. For Religion being useful to Society; and yet, in his Opinion, only a well-invented Fiction, all *experiments*, that is, all strict inquiries into its Nature, cannot but tend to weaken, rather than support, this useful Ally of Civil Government. But for a Man, who believes Religion to have come, and in an extraordinary manner, from God, to be alarmed with the danger of *experiments* as if Truth would not bear to be seen on all Sides, is the most ridiculous of all panic terrors. Might we not reasonably ask such a one, How it comes to pass, that *Experiments*, which are of so sovereign use in the Knowledge of *Nature*, should be calculated to make such havoc in the study of *Religion?* Are not Nature and Religion both the Offspring of God? Were not both given for human Contemplation? Have not both (as proceeding from the dark Recesses of his Throne) their depths and obscurities? And doth not the unfolding the Mysteries of his *moral Government* tend equally, with the displaying the Secrets of his *natural*, to the advancement of his glory, and the happiness of Mankind?

In a word, Had *no experiments been made in Nature*, we had still slept in the shade, or been kept entangled in the barren and thorny paths of SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY; and had *no experiments been made in Religion*, we had still kept blundering on in the dark and rugged Wilds of SCHOOL DIVINITY.

To conclude therefore, and in the words of our great Philosopher —"Let no man *upon a weak conceit of sobriety*, or an ill-applied *moderation*, think or maintain, that a man can search too far, or be too well studied in the book of GOD'S WORD, or in the book of GOD'S WORKS; but rather let Men endeavour AN ENDLESS PROGRESS OR PROFICIENCE IN BOTH: only let them beware that they apply both to CHARITY, and not to swelling; to USE, and not to ostentation; and again, that they do not UNWISELY MINGLE OR CONFOUND THESE LEARNINGS TOGETHER."*

* BACON, *Advancement of Learning*, lib. i.—Could we suppose the divinity of Bacon's Genius to have been such as that he foresaw the miserable havoc which a late Cabalistic Crew have made both of the WORKS and WORD of God by this impure and unnatural mixture, we can hardly conceive words more expressive, or a warning more awakening, than what is here contained in this caution against all such blind Workers in dirt and darkness.

THE

DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES

DEMONSTRATED.

BOOK IX.

CHAPTER I.

I BEGAN this Work by an ARGUMENT (long since compleated) to prove that A FUTURE STATE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS was not taught by Moses; but that, in its stead, *an equal or extraordinary Providence* was the Sanction of the LAW. And I now conclude it, with a corroboration of that ARGUMENT, by shewing, that *life and immortality was brought to light by the* GOSPEL alone.

From whence results this further Truth, That were MOSES and the PROPHETS the commissioned Servants of God; THEY COULD NOT, by their office, TEACH A FUTURE STATE; since it was ordained, and reserved for, the Ministry of JESUS.

Besides, What the LAW promised was to be obtained by WORKS. What the GOSPEL *brought to light*, under the name of *Salvation*, is to be procured by FAITH in a crucified Saviour and Redeemer. From these Truths will arise another proof of the *Divinity* both of the LAW and the GOSPEL.

But as all this can be shewn no otherwise, than by a distinct and collective view of the whole of God's moral Dispensation to Man, commencing with ADAM and compleated in JESUS CHRIST, I have made the NATURE AND GENIUS OF THE GOSPEL the subject of the Ninth and last Book of the DIVINE LEGATION.

Of the two immediately foregoing, namely the Seventh and the Eighth Books,* the first of them is employed in supporting the MAJOR and the MINOR propositions of the first Syllogism: by a continued history of the Religious Opinions of the Jewish People, on this matter, from the time of their earliest Prophets (who gave some dark intimations of a different dispensation), to the time of the *Maccabees*, when the Doctrine of a FUTURE STATE of rewards and punishments was become National.

* See p. 266 of this volume.

The other, namely the Eighth Book, is employed in supporting the MAJOR and the MINOR propositions of the second Syllogism; in which is considered the PERSONAL CHARACTER OF MOSES, and the GENIUS OF HIS LAW, so far forth as it concerns, or has a relation to *the Character of the* LAW-GIVER.

As the main Argument of all the foregoing Books, of THE NATURE AND GENIUS OF THE LAW, has been hitherto esteemed too Paradoxical; the Argument of this last, concerning THE NATURE AND GENIUS OF THE GOSPEL, it is more than probable, may be condemned, and by the same men, as being too *Orthodoxical:* For I have, long since, observed, that a religious Notion is apt to change its nature in the estimation of certain Divines, when it changes its Advocate.

Were I concerned with none but UNBELIEVERS, in this present Discourse, my only task, and a short one too, would be to prove the *reasonableness* of these which I hold to be the essential Doctrines of Christianity; for *Unbelievers* confess they are to be found in the *Gospel*, but deny them to be of divine Original, on account of the supposed absurdities which attend them; in the same manner that they have allowed the Doctrine of a *future state* not to be found in the LAW; and therefore denied that Dispensation to be given by God, because such an omission, they pretend, makes it unworthy of him. This, I say, had been a labour both short and easy, had I not to do, likewise, with a sort of BELIEVERS, who, as they held that the doctrine of a *future state* made part of the MOSAIC RELIGION, because they think the honour of the LAW requires that it should be found there; so, with the same spirit, they deny that the Doctrine of *Salvation in a Redeemer, by Faith alone*, makes a part of the CHRISTIAN RELIGION, because, they think, the honour of the GOSPEL requires that it should not be found there.

Enough hath been urged, in the course of the main Argument, against the *first* of these perversities: the *second* will detain us longer than such plain truths seem to require: because the attempt to shew the *reasonableness* of these which we call the essential Doctrines of Christianity, will be deemed immature, till we have established very clear and circumstantial evidence of their real existence in the SYSTEM: for laboured Discourses have been written to prove that FAITH ALONE includes WORKS; and that REDEMPTION, according to the *Scripture doctrine* of it, excludes a REDEEMER.

I am therefore, first of all, to prove the EXISTENCE of these Doctrines; and then, the REASONABLENESS of them. In doing which, I cannot but esteem it a *favourable circumstance*, if not a *happy omen*, that the very arguments employed to evince the *existence* of the Doctrines, do, at the same time, serve equally to shew the *reasonableness* of them.

A JOVE PRINCIPIUM was the formulary of ancient Piety and Wisdom, which served to introduce what the Sage had to deliver, of more than ordinary importance, for the instruction of Mankind. But here, the very nature of our present Argument will, of necessity, lead us up to the FIRST CAUSE, the Author of all Being.

For, without beginning at the CREATION, our view of these things would be narrow and obscure; and human judgment not sufficiently informed to enable it to conclude, with any degree of certainty, concerning a REVELATION, which is the completion of one great Moral System, the principles of which were laid in the disobedience of our first Parents.

In this Inquiry, as in all that have gone before, *our desire is, not to be carried up and down with the Waves of uncertain Arguments,* (to use the words of a great Master of Reason,) *but rather positively to lead on the Minds of the simpler Sort, by plain and easy degrees, till* THE VERY NATURE OF THE THING ITSELF DO MAKE MANIFEST WHAT IS TRUTH.*

Moses, in the account he gives of the CREATION, expresly tells us, that MAN, or the human species, was the *Work* of the SIXTH DAY.—"So God created Man in his own Image; in the Image of God created he him; MALE AND FEMALE CREATED HE THEM. And God blessed THEM, and God said unto THEM, be fruitful and multiply and *replenish the Earth,* and have dominion over—every living thing that moveth upon the Earth. And God said, behold I have given you every herb bearing seed which is upon the face of the Earth, and *every Tree,* in which is the fruit of a Tree yielding seed, *to you it shall be for meat.*—And the evening and the morning were the SIXTH DAY." † Yet, because the formation of WOMAN, from the side of MAN, was not *circumstantially* related till after the account of God's placing Man in PARADISE,‡ both Jews and Christians § have generally concurred in one Opinion, that EVE was not *created* till ADAM was put into possession of the Garden of Eden; for they took it for granted, that Moses (though in a Moral or Religious history of the *Creation and Fall of Man)* had observed a Chronologic Order.

The very absurdity of this Opinion renders the mistake so apparent, that the Reader should not have been troubled with a formal confutation of it, did not the right stating of the fact (so inconsiderable, as on first sight it may be thought,) serve to confirm a Truth, which hath been generally overlooked, though of the utmost importance

* HOOKER'S "Ecclesiastical Polity." † Gen. i. 27—31. ‡ Gen. ii. 8—22. § Le Clerc says—"L'Écriture nous apprend formellement qu'Adam donna les noms aux animaux, entre lesquels, il n'en trouvoit aucun pour l'assister; *apres quoi Dieu* CREA *la Femme* de l'une des côtés de l'Homme."—*Sentimens de quelques Theol.* p. 423.—DR. Z. PEARCE, in his "Notes on Milton against Bentley," p. 233. And HOOKER, in his "Ecclesiastical Polity," book v. sect. 73. *Woman was even in her first Estate framed by nature not only* AFTER IN TIME, *but inferior in excellencie.*

towards our obtaining a just idea of *Revealed Religion;* as will be seen in the course of this inquiry.

1. First, therefore, let it be observed, that *Eve* could not be created in the *Garden;* since we are expresly told, that she was created along with Adam, some time before, namely, on the *sixth day.—Male and female created he them.*—A declaration so decisive, that the Rabbins, who will needs have *Eve* compleatly formed in Paradise, gathered from the Words—*Male and Female,* (used by the historian, where he speaks of the Creation of the *sixth Day)* that *Adam* was an *Androgune,* a double Animal, or *Man-Woman,* joined side to side; * and that the operation of disjoining them was performed in the *Garden;* where indeed Jesus tells us, not a *separation,* but a *closer union* commenced.

2. When Moses gives us the Book *of the generations of Adam,*† he repeats what he had delivered before, that man was created male and female.—*Male and female created he them,* AND CALLED THEIR NAME ADAM, IN THE DAY WHEN THEY WERE CREATED.‡ Adam was the common name for man and woman; and that name was given them when the *Male* was created; consequently the *female* was created with him.

3. On the other hand, the same kind of reasoning which concludes, that the *Woman* was not created till after the *sixth day,* will conclude, that the *man* himself was not created till after that day: for, if we suppose the History of the Creation observes a strict chronologic Order, he was not created till after the *seventh day:* the sacred Writer, immediately after recording the WORK of the *six days* and the REST of the *seventh,* proceeds thus, *And the Lord formed man of the dust of the Ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.*§ Then follows the story of his being put into Paradise—of his deep sleep—of the Woman formed from his side. If, to this argument, so similar in all its parts, it be replied, that the direct assertion of Man's creation on the *sixth day* is alone sufficient to prove that the after mention of his *formation from the*

* This Jewish interpretation of the text appears to have been very ancient: and to have come early to the knowledge of the Heathen-World. *Plato,* in his *Symposium,* brings in one Aristophanes saying, that the ancient nature of man was not as we find it at present, but very different. He was originally Ανδρογυνος, a *man-woman.*—This fancy affords occasion to a pretty Fable, perhaps of the Philosopher's own invention, that these Ανδρογυνοι were a kind of double-animal, joined back to back. But that Jupiter, when he set them a-going in the World, slit every one of them, and then shuffling the separated parts well together, committed them to their fortune: and the employment of each of them being to find out its partner, the business of life was an incessant search of every one for its *better half,* in order to be rejoined in a more commodious manner. This, says the Philosopher, is the true origin of *Love.* † Gen. v. ‡ Verse 2. § Gen. ii. 7. *Philo,* misled by the common error, that a chronological order was observed in the history of the *Creation,* concluded that the *Adam,* created in the Image of God, Gen. i. 27, was a different man from him who was *formed of the dust of the Ground,* Gen. ii. 7.

dust of the Ground is but a repetition of, with an addition to, the first account; by which alone the TIME of Man's creation is to be determined: if, I say, this be replied, I shall take the benefit of the Answer, in favour of what I have assigned for the *time* of *Eve's* creation, where I consider the account of her *formation from the Rib*, just in the same light that the Objector sees Adam's formation *from the dust of the Ground;* that is to say, as a repetition only (with other circumstances added) of what the Historian had before told us, of Eve's creation on the *sixth day*, in these words—MALE *and* FEMALE *created he them.**

But further, on a supposition of a Chronological Order in the relation, we shall be forced to conclude, not only that *Eve* was created in Paradise, but that she was not created till AFTER *the command was given not to eat of the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil;* for the *command* is found in the seventeenth verse of this Chapter, and her *formation from the Rib*, not till we come to the twenty-second verse: consequently the prohibition did not bind or affect Eve. Yet she tells the Serpent (and sure she did not pay him in his own coin) that this prohibition equally concerned both her and Adam.—WE *may eat of the fruit of the trees of the Garden; but of the Tree which is in the midst of the Garden, God hath said,* YE *shall not eat of it.*† And accordingly, sentence is pronounced by God upon *her* transgression, as well as upon *his.*‡

5. But lastly, to cut the matter short, the Historian expresly tells us, that God *finished the work of creation in six days, and rested the seventh day from all his work which he had made.*§ *Eve*, therefore, must needs have been created with *Adam* on the SIXTH DAY.

Two points then, only remain to be considered.

1. Why Moses thought it expedient to give so very particular a relation of *Eve's formation from the Rib?*

2. And why he did not chuse to relate this circumstance in the place where he mentions her *Creation on the sixth day?*

1. The account of Eve's formation from the *Rib* was, without doubt, given, to inform us, that the UNION of the two Sexes, for the propagation of their kind, was of a nature more noble and sublime than the *consorting* of other Animals, who were all equally bid, like *Man*, to *increase and multiply.* For as the Poet says,

> "Not Man alone, but all that roam the Wood,
> Or wing the Sky, or roll along the flood,
> Each loves itself, but not itself alone,
> Each sex desires alike."—

Thus far the common appetite impells; and Man and Beasts are equally subject to this second Law of Earthly Beings. But, from henceforth, it becomes, in MAN, a very superior Passion.

* Gen. i. 27. † Gen. iii. 2, 3. ‡ Gen. iii. 13—19. § Gen. ii. 2.

—"The Young dismiss'd, to wander Earth or Air;
There stops the Instinct, and there ends the Care:
A longer care MAN'S helpless kind demands:
That longer care contracts more lasting bands:
REFLEXION, REASON still the ties improve;
At once extend the interest and the love."

Now as REVELATION was given us (amongst other purposes, more peculiar, indeed, and important) to support and strengthen the Operations of *Reflexion* and the Conclusions of *Reason*, what could better serve the general design, while these were improving for the good of the Offspring, than to instruct us in this closer relation between the Parents, which arose from a personal Union, prior to that of reciprocal fondness?

But the Historian still more expresly instructs us in the end for which he recorded *Eve's formation from the Rib*, where he makes Adam say, or rather says himself—*Therefore shall a Man leave his Father and his Mother, and shall cleave to his Wife; and they shall be one flesh:* alluding to what they originally were, before the separation of the *Rib*.

But the allusions of *Inspired Writers* go further (of which I have given many instances) than just to ornament the discourse with the elegance of the conceit. Their chief end is to support the particular *Truth* there inculcated. Thus it is in the Text we are now considering; it contains an instruction partly declarative, and partly preceptive.—In mere *Animals*, observant of the command to *increase and multiply*, the Offspring, when enabled to provide for itself, is dismissed from the Parent's Wing, by an instinctive provision, which equally disposeth both to a Separation. But the REFLEXION and REASON bestowed upon *Man*, which engaged the Parent to *a longer care*, in protecting, and providing for, its Offspring, impresseth on the Offspring, in its turn, a tender sense of gratitude, and love towards the Parent, for the benefits received in that defenceless state; and naturally disposeth it to be attentive to the welfare of the Parent, when flattered by the glorious duty of returning an obligation. This might somewhat impede or run counter to the first great Command and blessing, which, in the infancy of the world, especially, required all possible encouragement: Therefore, by the most divine address it is here directed, that we should suffer this tye to give place to one more important—*Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave to his Wife.*

2. With regard to the second point—Why Moses did not chuse to relate the Story of the *Rib*, where he mentions Eve's Creation, on the *sixth day*—This may be easily understood. The Story of the Woman's formation from the *Rib* is, as may be seen from the sequel of the story, of so much concern in domestic life, that we cannot conceive a fitter place for it than this, where we find it, in the

Entrance upon the fatal effects of our first Parent's idle curiosity: from which Posterity might draw a Lesson of great importance, viz. —the mutual obligation incumbent on each Sex, when united, to watch over the other's conduct, equally with its own; as nothing can affect the welfare of the one, in which the other will not be equally concerned; each being destined to bear, together with his own, the other's share, whether of good or evil. The account, therefore, of *Eve's formation* was, with much art and decorum, omitted in the place where the Chronologist would expect to find it; and postponed, till it could be delivered with the advantage of being made an introduction to the history of the FALL.

The best Historians have, in the same manner, created beauties from a well-contrived neglect of the order of time.

The next thing to be considered, after the Mosaic account of the CREATION of Man, is, what we are told concerning his SPECIFIC NATURE.

That he was of a nobler Kind than any other of the Animals brought, at the same time, into *Being*, abundantly appears from the LIKENESS in which he was *made;* and from the PREEMINENCE which was given to him over the rest. "And God said, let us make *Man* IN OUR IMAGE, after our likeness; and let him have DOMINION over the fish of the Sea, and over the fowl of the Air, and over the Cattle, and over all the Earth."*

Now, in what did this *image* or *likeness* consist? Certainly not in Man's having an IMMATERIAL PART, since he had *this*, as the best Philosophy evinceth,† in common with the whole animal Creation. And the Historian makes the *image*, or *likeness*, to consist in something peculiar to Man. Now, the only two things, peculiar to him, are his SHAPE and his REASON. None but an Anthropomorphite will say, that it was his *Shape*, which reflected this Image of his Creator. We must conclude therefore, that it was the faculty of REASON which made the resemblance.

But further, when God says, *let us make Man in our Image*, it is immediately subjoined—*and let him have dominion* over the whole brute Creation. Now, nothing but the faculty of *Reason* could invest man with this *Dominion*, DE FACTO, which was bestowed upon him, DE JURE.

Still further, we see *Dominion* was given him on account of this preeminence of being made in the image of God—*Let us make man in our Image, and let him have Dominion*—But a *preeminence*, which qualified Man for *Dominion* over other Animals, could be nothing but REASON, which he had, and which they wanted; whereas an immaterial principle, with which both were endowed, afforded no room for

* Gen. i. 26.

† See note A, at the end of this book.

preeminence; especially such a preeminence as qualified Man for Dominion.

But now the substance in which the faculty of *Reason* resides, could not be a *material substance*, as this best Philosophy, we say, hath shewn.* *Man*, therefore, must needs consist of an *immaterial* Substance, joined to a *material;* or, in other words, he must be a compound of SOUL and BODY. And this seems to be intimated, and not obscurely neither, by the Words of the Text; when it comes, in the *second Chapter*, to give a more distinct account of Man's Nature than hath been given in the preceding Chapter, where He is placed, according to the order of time, in the new-framed System of Creation. —*The Lord God formed* MAN *of the* DUST OF THE GROUND, *and breathed into his nostrils* THE BREATH OF LIFE, *and Man became* A LIVING SOUL.†

By the words—*the breath of life*, and *a living Soul*—which discriminate LIFE in man from LIFE in brutes, we are not to understand *immateriality* simply; since all animals, as we say, have this in common; but the CONTINUANCE of *life* after the separation of the compound, in virtue of Man's *rationality;* which making him responsible for his Actions, may, according to the different parts in God's MORAL œconomy, require *that* separate existence.

But now, if it should be asked, Why this compleat exposition of Man's Nature was not given before, in the *first* mention of his Creation, but reserved for the *second*, two very important reasons may be assigned.

1. Had the Historian given it in the first account of Man's Creation, it would have had the appearance of distinguishing Man, in his natural or physical capacity, from other Animals; whereas, in this capacity, there is, in truth, no difference between them. Since the very argument which evinceth the *immateriality* of the *human* soul, evinceth the immateriality of the *brutal*. Yet, to have left no mark of distinction between them when there was one, had been a very faulty omission in the History of Religion. Moses, therefore, with admirable address, hath pointed out the difference, when he tells us, that *Man was created in the Image of God,*‡ i. e. endowed with the faculty of REASON.

2. Secondly, the place, which points out this difference, is made to serve for an introduction to the History of *the free gift of immortality*. And a better cannot be conceived than that which teacheth us, that the *Subject*, on whom this gift was bestowed, is, by the *immateriality* of his Physical Nature, capable of enjoying it; and, by the *freedom* of his reasonable Nature, accountable for the abuse of it.

* See CLARKE and BAXTER, as represented in the note A, above referred to.
† Gen. ii. 7. ‡ Gen. i. 27.

So much is observed in honour of that exquisite knowledge with which the sacred Writer was endowed.

Having thus explained *Man's* PHYSICAL Nature, we come to the consideration of his MORAL; which, hitherto, we have but just hinted at, in shewing him to be responsible for his Actions. Now, as this *responsibility* is the great Principle on which all Religion, or rather the sanction of Religion, is founded; and as it is of the utmost use in our enquiry concerning the true nature of the GOSPEL, to understand what Mode of Religion it was to which Adam became subject, when he first rose from the forming hand of his Creator; we must recollect what hath been said concerning the TIME of his Creation, which, we shall now see, will stand us in good stead to determine this important question.

1. For from thence it will appear, that the Man and Woman, the *Male and Female*, were not immediately, on their Creation, put into Paradise; but had a State and Condition upon Earth preceding that supernatural Establishment.

That this first State of Man in the world at large was not only prior to, but different from, his State in Paradise, the Sacred Writer clearly intimates: *God* (says he) on the creation of Man *(male and female) blessed them, and said unto them, be fruitful and multiply, and* REPLENISH THE EARTH, *and subdue it.**

But when, after they were put in possession of PARADISE, and the *gift of immortality* was there bestowed upon them, they were not (immediately at least) to *replenish the Earth* at large; but to *replenish Paradise* only: from whence, as they increased, their Colonies, perhaps, might be sent out to inhabit for a time the other parts of the Earth (not, then, a vale of misery and *death,)* before they *replenished* the Regions of the Blessed.

2. Again, at the Creation of the first Pair—*God said, Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is* UPON THE FACE OF THE EARTH; *and* EVERY TREE *in which is the seed of a Tree, yielding seed,* TO YOU IT SHALL BE FOR MEAT.† But when God put them into *Paradise,* he said, *Of every Tree in the Garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the* TREE *of the Knowledge of good and evil,* THOU SHALT NOT EAT OF IT.‡

Hence it appears that Adam and Eve had a MORAL STATE, or were engaged to some Religion, before their Paradisaical life commenced, and different from it; for in the first, there was no restraint of food; in the second, there was. Whether the *Religion,* to which they were first subject, was that we call NATURAL, as being the result and conclusion of that Reason with which, at our Creation, we were endowed; or whether it was that we call REVEALED, or supernaturally taught by God, we can only learn from Scripture. And

* Gen. i. 28. † Gen. i. 29. ‡ Gen. ii. 16, 17.

Scripture teacheth, even by its Silence, that it was NATURAL RELIGION to which the first Pair were subject, from their Creation to their entrance into Paradise.

For Scripture hath this advantage over human compositions, that it teacheth as precisely by what it doth not say, as by what it doth. In what concerns Religion, there is nothing, either in its silence or in its enunciation, that is ambiguous.

To give an instance, for the better illustration of the matter before us. SPEECH might be acquired *naturally*, as well as RELIGION. In this they agreed: In one thing they differed—Human Reason, which was able to instruct in both, teacheth *Religion*, or our duty to our Maker, and to each other, almost instantaneously: But *Speech*, in the same School, is learnt only by slow degrees. So that *Man* must have continued long in that brutal State, to which the rest of the Animal Creation were, from their very Nature, condemned. Yet it is hard to suppose, that the all-gracious Author of our Being would leave his Favourite Creature, Man, whom he had endowed with superior gifts and prerogatives above the rest, to struggle with this mute and distressful condition, from which, unaided reason could only, by slow degrees, in a length of time, set him free. But this uncertainty holy Scripture removes; by the information it hath given us, that God himself, and not human Reason, was our first Schoolmaster in the rudiments of Speech. The text says—*And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and* BROUGHT THEM UNTO ADAM, TO SEE WHAT HE WOULD CALL THEM; AND WHATSOEVER ADAM CALLED EVERY LIVING CREATURE, THAT WAS THE NAME THEREOF. AND ADAM GAVE NAMES TO ALL CATTLE—.* Here we have the most natural and familiar image of a Teacher and a learner; where the abilities of the Scholar are *tried* before they are *assisted*. From this text, we likewise learn, that no more than the first rudiments of Speech were thus, in an extraordinary manner, imparted to Adam for his present and immediate use. He was assisted in affixing *names to sensible things*, with which he was to be perpetually conversant. And this was sufficient to put his *reasonable nature* in a train to advance itself above the torpid silence of the *brutal*. Thus far was man *taught of God*. But the further extent and improvement of speech, particularly in its giving *names to more abstract ideas*, was left to man alone; which *names*, as his necessities required, he would invent, and treasure up for use.

This difference, in the two acquirements of *Speech* and *Religion*, both of which natural Reason was able to teach, but not with equal facility or speed, shews why God interfered in the one case, and why

* Gen. ii. 19, 20.

he did not interfere in the other; and consequently why the Historian's *enunciation* was necessary in the first instance; and why his SILENCE, in the second, was sufficient to give equal evidence to what was the truth.

This (which indeed concerns the subject in hand) appears still clearer from the following considerations:

1. The PENTATEUCH is a professed history of God's communication with, and extraordinary dispensations to, Man, from the placing him in PARADISE to the giving of the LAW. We have seen, that Man was subject to a *Religion*, prior to that *Will of God revealed* to him when he entered Paradise. Now, were the State, under which he lived before the Paradisaical, the State of *revealed Religion*, the Nature of the Mosaic history required that some account should have been given of it. But no account is given. We conclude, therefore, that Man, on his Creation, came under the law of NATURAL RELIGION, or was, as the Apostle emphatically expresses it—*a Law unto himself*.* On this supposition, we can easily account for the *Silence* of the Historian. His Theme was REVEALED RELIGION; and to preserve the memory of such a Dispensation, it was necessary that the various modes of it should be recorded. But the memory of *Natural Religion* was preserved by an earlier Recorder, REASON: who wrote it, and continues to write it, in the minds of all Men. Of this original Record, Moses hath given sufficient intimation, where, speaking of Man's nature, he tells, that it was created in the LIKENESS OF GOD: meaning (as hath been shewn) that Man was endowed with REASON. Now such a LIKENESS implies his knowledge of, and confessed subjection to, NATURAL LAW OR RELIGION.

2. But it is not only from the *Silence* of the Historian, as to what preceded Man's migration into Paradise, but likewise from what he expressly *tells us* followed on Man's situation there, that we conclude, he was from his creation to this time, under the guidance of the LAW OF NATURE only: For the REVEALED LAW of God to Man in Paradise, after bestowing upon him the *free gift* of immortality, consists but of one *positive Command*, as the condition of this accumulated blessing: a condition very different from any of those which *Natural Religion* requires to entitle Man to God's *favour*: This plainly implies, that Adam, by the Light of Reason, knew already the rest of God's Will, with which, as Moral Governor of the World, he had irradiated the breasts of all Men. Otherwise, had this light been so dim as to give no clear direction for his duty, we must conclude, that the all-gracious Creator would have expressly delivered to him a complete Code or Digest of *Natural Law*, at the time when he enounced this *revealed Command* in Paradise. And that he did not give any such,

* Rom. ii. 14.

the *Silence* of the Historian, in a work whose Nature would not dispense with such an omission, is a certain proof.

To sum up all in a word—Man's moral State, under the *revealed Will* of God, began on his admission into Paradise. From which truth it follows, that, from his Creation to that time, he was under the guidance of NATURAL RELIGION.

And here let me just make an observation (which it would be a fault to neglect, though it be but one of the numerous instances of divine art in this inspired Writer) concerning the different terms employed by him in defining *Man* as the subject of *Natural Religion*, from those he uses in defining him as the subject of the *Revealed*. In the first case, Man is characterised by that distinctive quality of his being made in the *likeness of God*,* or being endowed with REASON; the faculty which denotes him the subject of *Natural Religion;* that Religion which teacheth the rewards and punishments of Heaven INDEFINITELY. In the second case, he is distinguished as a compound Being, made of *the dust of the earth, and the breath of life*,† which marks him out for the adequate subject of that other Religion, denouncing *death* and *immortality* DEFINITELY.

To proceed.—This *natural* State of Man, antecedent to the *Paradisaical*, can never be too carefully kept in mind, nor too precisely explained; since it is the very KEY, or CLEW (as we shall find in the progress of this work) which is to open to us, and to lead us through, all the recesses and intimacies of the *last*, and *compleated*, *Dispensation* of God to Man; a Dispensation long become intricate and perplexed, by men's neglecting to distinguish these two States or Conditions; which, as we say, if not constantly kept in mind, the GOSPEL can neither be well understood nor reasonably supported.

So terribly mistaken have those good Men been, who imagined, that the best way of serving the cause of *Revelation* was to deny the very being and existence of *Natural Religion*.

But if some have allowed too little to *this Religion*, there are others, and those no declared enemies of *Revelation*, who have ascribed a great deal too much to it. Systems which, however different, are yet alike injurious to the great Truth they profess to defend.

The one, by annihilating *Natural Religion*, cuts away the *ground and foundation* of CHRISTIANITY; the other, by giving to *Natural Religion* certain Doctrines of Perfection, to which it doth not pretend, overturns the *Superstructure*.

Having thus shewn that Man lived, at first, under the guidance of *Natural Religion;* let us now consider more precisely, but with all possible brevity, What this Religion is, and what it teacheth.

If my ideas, whether innate or acquired, do not mislead me, the

* Gen. i. 26. † Gen. ii. 7.

whole of it may be comprised in this—"That Man, endowed with REASON and FREEDOM OF WILL, is a Moral Agent, and accountable for his Conduct to his Maker; who hath given him, for his rule of Life, a LAW, discoverable by the one Faculty, and rendered practicable by the other.—That the faithful Observers of this LAW God will reward, and the wilful Transgressors of it he will punish; but that, on repentance and amendment, he will pardon, and be reconciled to, Offenders."

This SANCTION of *Natural Religion*, evident as it is, hath been brought into question, and disputed, not only by those who reject our idea of such a moral System, but by those who contend for it.

The *first* have said, that we know so little of God's government of the universe, that it is hazardous to affirm, that Man hath any claim at all to Reward. The *other*, that it is still more hazardous to affirm, that REPENTANCE will certainly restore bad Men to the benefit of this Claim, if, before their transgression, they had any such.

Yet the Truths (thus boldly brought in question) are founded on this clear principle, "That, taking in the whole of a good Man's existence, God will bestow upon him more of happiness than of misery." To deny this, will tend to confound our distinct ideas of a good and of an evil Governor of the World. Nor are these truths, thus founded, at all shaken by *our ignorance* of God's government of the universe. I apprehend, that the supposed force of the objection ariseth from Men's not rightly distinguishing between God's PHYSICAL and MORAL Government; nor seeing how the consequences of that distinction direct our judgment to decide of the evidence in religious matters, and particularly of the force of this objection. I will not here repeat my reasoning on this subject, which the reader may find already delivered in the 329th and 330th pages of the *Introduction*, and will see repeated, occasionally, hereafter. In behalf of these repetitions, had I added one more, on the present occasion, I should have no need to apologize: for as often as an old argument supports a Truth, newly attacked, the use of that argument, on such an occasion, cannot be called a repetition of it, but a different application of it to a new question. And every different application will give additional credit to the solidity of the argument, when it is seen how many various purposes it may be made to serve, and how many various Truths it is fitted to illustrate. This is one of those FRUITFUL ARGUMENTS, frequently to be met with in this Work, which I have enforced again and again, in the support of *some new Truth;* and which, I make no doubt, a less attentive Reader has as often condemned for a *repetition of the same thing*.

From this Argument, so referred to, as it lies in the *Introduction*, we may safely conclude, that *a good man hath a claim to reward.*

And this, I think, Religionists, consulting no more than their natural ideas, have generally agreed in; and yet have generally concurred to deny that other part of the proposition (though it stand upon the same Principle) which teacheth, that God will re-establish the repentant Sinner in his original claim to divine favour.

This may seem unaccountable; but there is a secret in it, which will deserve to be explained, for more reasons than one; but at present, principally for the sake of removing this difficulty.

The truth is, those Divines, who doubted of this *re-establishment*, laboured under a groundless apprehension, that to allow the Doctrine of *reconciliation, on sincere repentance alone*, might tend to supersede the necessity of the *Christian Revelation;* which they erroneously supposed taught nothing concerning a future state but what was discoverable, and had been actually discovered, by the *light of Nature:* So that if natural Religion taught ONE means of *Reconciliation*, and *Revelation* taught ANOTHER, both could not be true. They, therefore, rejected that, as false, which *natural Religion* was said to teach. And modern Unbelievers being under the like delusion, viz. that *natural Religion and revealed* taught the same doctrine concerning a future state, reject, as false, that *means of reconciliation* which *Revelation* pretends to have discovered.

But we have bestowed our pains to little purpose, if, by this time, the attentive Reader doth not perceive, that the *Rewards*, taught by *natural Religion*, are very different in *kind*, as well as in *degree*, from those taught by the *Revealed:* However, if he hath not yet been sufficiently instructed in this important truth, the sequel of our Discourse, to which we are now hastening, will, we hope, give him entire satisfaction.

I had said, and on the Authority of St. Paul himself, that *natural Religion* taught, that *God is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek him.** Now, from his being a *Rewarder*, which springs from his nature and attributes, I have ventured to found Man's *claim to reward.*

But it may be asked, WHERE are those rewards to be expected, and of WHAT quality do they consist?

To the first part of the question, I reply—That, at what time soever God's Providence hath been dispensed EQUALLY to the Sons of Adam, living under the direction of *natural Law*, they could expect their reward only HERE. But, whenever they began to observe, that God's Providence was grown UNEQUAL, and that rewards and punishments were not regularly dispended *here*, they would look to have the disorder rectified HEREAFTER. But of this, more as we proceed.

To the second part of the question, Of WHAT quality these rewards consist? I reply, We are taught to believe, they shall be abundant, as

* Heb. xi. 6.

suited to that better state of existence to which they are reserved; and as bestowed by an all-bountiful Master, to whose more intimate presence they shall be admitted: yet still bearing some adequate proportion to Man's merit and desert.

If REASON, on the one hand, seems to revolt at the thoughts of *everlasting Punishment;* (for, as God is a Rewarder of the Good, we must conclude, the Apostle would have us infer, that he is a *Punisher* of the Bad; since this exercise of his power, over both Good and Bad, stands on the same attributes of *Goodness* and *Justice;)* If REASON, I say, doth, on the one hand, seem to revolt at *everlasting Punishment*, we must confess, that FANCY, on the other, (even when full plumed by *Vanity)*, hath scarce force enough to rise to the idea of *infinite rewards*. How the heart of Man came to conceive this to be an adequate retribution for his right conduct, during the short trial of his Virtue here, would be hard to tell, did we not know what Monsters PRIDE begot of old upon *Pagan Philosophy;* and how much greater still these latter ages have disclosed, by the long incubation of *School-divinity* upon *Folly*.

What hath been urged from natural reason, in support of this extravagant presumption, is so very slender, that it recoils as you inforce it. 1. First, you say, "that the SOUL, the subject of these eternal rewards, being *immaterial*, and so therefore unaffected by the causes which bring material things to an end, is, by its nature, fitted for eternal rewards." This is an argument *ad ignorantiam*, and holds no farther—Because an *immaterial* Being is not subject to that mode of dissolution which affects *material* substances, you conclude it to be eternal. This is going too fast. There may be, and probably are, many natural causes, (unknown, indeed, to us,) whereby immaterial Beings come to an end. But if the nature of things cannot, yet certainly God can, put a period to such a Being, when it hath served the purpose of its Creation. Doth ANNIHILATION impeach that Wisdom and Goodness which was displayed when God brought it OUT OF NOTHING?

Other *immaterial* Beings there are (as hath been observed) who have the same natural security with man for their existence, of whose *eternity* we never dream; I mean the Souls of Brutes. But PRIDE, as the Poet observes, *calls God unjust:*

> "If MAN alone ingross not Heaven's high care;
> Alone made *perfect* here, IMMORTAL there."

Fanatics, indeed, both New and Old, have well provided for the proper eternity of the human Soul, by making it a part or portion of the substance of God himself.* But so blasphemous a fancy, all

* See note B, at the end of this book.

sober Christians, from the most early times to the present, have looked upon with horror.

However, let us (for argument's sake) allow the human Soul to be unperishable by nature, and secured in its existence by the unchangeable will of God: and see what will follow from thence.—An *infinite* Reward for Virtue, during one moment of its existence, because Reason discovers that, by the Law of Nature, some Reward is due? By no means—When God hath amply repaid us for the performance of our duty, will he be at a loss how to dispose of us for the long remainder of ETERNITY? May he not find new and endless employment for reasonable Creatures, to which, when properly discharged, new rewards, and in endless succession, will be assigned? Modest Reason seems to dictate this to the Followers of the *Law of Nature*. The flattering expedient of ETERNAL REWARDS, for Virtue here, was invented in the simplicity of early speculation, after it had fairly brought men to conclude that the soul was *immaterial*.

2. A second Argument, from the conviction it carries with it, I would recommend to the care and protection of its Discoverers, the *Platonists* and *Poets;* namely, Men's LONGINGS AFTER IMMORTALITY, even in the *state of Nature*. These, say our Poetical Metaphysicians, and Metaphysical Poets, are a proof that we shall obtain what we long for; since natural appetites were not given in vain. The *foundation*, on which this argument stands, is not, it must be confessed, quite void of all plausibility. The general appetite for GOOD was indeed given by Nature, to aid us in the easier and speedier attainment of it. But in this consists the sophistry of the reasoning —Because the appetite for *Good* is essential in the constitution of every sensitive Being, it is concluded, that we shall obtain the GREATEST GOOD which the *Imagination* can form, for the object of its wishes. And, to call this visionary Operator, *Nature*, and not *Fancy*, will scarce mend the matter, if the noble Philosopher * did not vilify his species, when he said, that *She did not know how to keep a mean or measure.*† The Phænomenon is easily explained. The PASSIONS were given to excite our Activity in the pursuit of *Good:* and the violence of such of them, as drive most impetuously to their end, will be apt to transgress the *mean*. But there is another part as essential to our frame, which is REASON; and her office it is to keep the Passions within due bounds; then most apt to fly out, when pursued by that frightful Phantom, ANNIHILATION. And as the best security against this terror is the *pledge of immortality*, we are too much in haste to inquire of *Reason*, Whether, indeed, NATURAL RELIGION hath given us this security.

From all that hath been said, I would infer, that our appetites, or

* BACON. † *Modum tenere nescia est.*

LONGINGS after good, were given us, not to lead the conclusions of *Reason*, but to be led by them, lest these LONGINGS should become extravagant.

3. But the palmary argument is still behind. It is partly Physical, and partly Moral. "The merit of service" (say these Men) "increases in proportion to the excellence of that Being to whom our service is directed and becomes acceptable. An infinite Being, therefore, can dispense no rewards but what are infinite. And thus the Virtuous Man becomes intitled to immortality."

The misfortune is, that this reasoning holds equally on the side of the UNMERCIFUL DOCTORS, as they are called, who doom the Wicked to EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT. Indeed, were this the only discredit under which it labours, the *merciless Doctors* would hold themselves little concerned. But the truth is, the Argument from *infinity* proves just nothing. To make it of any force, both the Parties should be *infinite*. This inferior emanation of God's *Image*, MAN, should either be supremely good or supremely bad, a kind of Deity or Devil. But these Reasoners, in their attention to the *Divinity*, overlook the *Humanity*, which makes the decrease keep pace with the accumulation, till the rule of Logic, that *the conclusion follows the weaker part*, comes in, to end the dispute.

This view of things, which presents to us the reward, held out by the *Law of Nature*, clears up, at the same time, the more disputed question, concerning *the efficacy of repentance alone*, to reinstate us in God's FAVOUR; and shews, that this doctrine of *Natural Religion* is very consistent with what *Revealed* Religion teacheth, concerning RECONCILIATION, on repentance: since the rewards, promised by each Religion, being totally different, they may reasonably, when forfeited, have different means appointed for their recovery. Hence it is, that, by the *first*, simple repentance, we say, is deemed sufficient; and, by the latter, some ATONEMENT may be reasonably required, together with repentance.

On the whole of what has been said concerning *Natural Religion*, we see, That REASON reclaims against the pride of such of its votaries, who expect *eternal rewards*, when that Religion only promiseth very ample ones.

Come we now to the Condition of Man under REVEALED RELIGION. For God (as we must needs conclude) having tried Adam in the STATE OF NATURE, and approved of the good use he had made of his free-will under the direction of that light, advanced him to a superior station in *Paradise*. How LONG, before this remove, Man had continued subject to *Natural Religion* alone, we can only guess. But of this we may be assured, that it was some considerable time before the Garden of Eden could naturally be made fit for his reception. Since

Moses, when he had concluded his History of the Creation, and of God's *rest* on, and *sanctification* of, the *seventh day*,* proceeds to speak of the condition of this new world, in the following terms :— *And God created every living plant of the field, before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew; for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth.*† Which seem plainly to intimate, that when the seeds of vegetables had been created on the *third day*, they were left to Nature, in its ordinary operations, to mature by Sun and showers. So that when, in course of time, Paradise was become capable of accommodating its inhabitants, they were transplanted thither.—"And the Lord took the Man, and put him into the Garden of Eden—And the Lord God commanded the Man, saying, Of every Tree of the Garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." ‡ In this manner, was the first extraordinary revelation of God's Will, or what we call REVEALED RELIGION, added to, or more properly built upon, the *Religion of Nature;* which continued to be the foundation of all God's extraordinary Dispensations throughout the whole course of his moral Government of Man.

Well! Adam disobeyed the Command. He ate, and became (as he was first created) MORTAL.—*And lest* (as the Historian says) *he should put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever,*§ he is driven out of Paradise, and sent back again to his former State; the subject of *natural Religion*. And in this subjection he continued till the giving of the LAW.

From this account we learn, that, had Adam not disobeyed the Command, he would have lived for ever, exempt from the present condition of *mortality;* since this return to it was the penalty of his transgression.

And lest we should make a wrong inference from what we read, that *immortal life* was Man's *natural claim* from the time of his creation; and not a *free gift* bestowed upon him on his entrance into Paradise; the Historian tells us of the means employed to exclude him from the TREE OF LIFE, which conferred *immortality* on the Eater. The ideas which this language conveys are, indeed, *allegorical;* but they inform us of this, and of nothing but this, that *immortal life was a thing extraneous to our Nature;* and not put into our paste or composition, when first fashioned by the forming hand of the Creator.‖

If it be asked, why Moses did not record this free gift of immor-

* Gen. ii. 2, 3. † Verses 4, 5. ‡ Verse 15—17. § Gen. iii. 22. ‖ Gen. ii. 7. "And the Lord formed man of the dust of the ground," &c., compared with Gen. iii. 19.

tality, lost by the first Adam, in as open and clear terms as the second Adam proclaimed the *recovery* of it? the reason will be given, more at large, hereafter. At present, I shall just observe, (though, perhaps, a little prematurely) that the several MESSENGERS of God's several *Revelations* had each his proper office to discharge. It was the office of JESUS to *bring life and immortality to light*, or to promulge the doctrine of it in open day. It was MOSES's office to record the *loss*, and TO SUPPLY THE WANT OF IT,* in that Dispensation which was committed to his Charge. He could go no further than just to hint at a *recovery*, in covert and obscure expressions.

On these different and respective grounds then stood, and must for ever stand, NATURAL and REVEALED Religion.

The first teacheth an abundant *reward* for *virtue;* the other promised a *blessed immortality* on the observance of a *positive command.*

This distinction, carefully kept in mind, will reflect great lights upon both Religions. As, by the neglect of it, the *Mosaic* Dispensation hath lain, for many ages, involved in obscurities; and the *Christian* is become subject to inexplicable difficulties. This will be seen as we proceed.

At present let it suffice to observe, 1. That this account of the Paradisaical State supports our Capital Assertion, that *Natural* Religion neither teacheth nor promiseth *eternal Rewards.* While it is supposed to do so, nothing can be conceived more discrediting of REVELATION; for it will force us to conclude, that God arbitrarily annexed *Salvation*, or eternal life, to one condition by the *Law of Grace*, and to another condition by the *Law of Nature.* This observation will have its weight with those plain men, who allow, to the two connected Laws, the common privilege of explaining one another.

2. It enables us to see clearly into another reason, why the *condition of immortality* was the observance of a *positive command;* and not the performance of moral duty at large. For *immortal life* being a *free-gift* to which no man had a claim by nature, it might be given on whatever *condition* best pleased the Benefactor. And the observance of a *positive duty* was very fitly preferred to a *moral;* as it best marked out the nature of the benefit, which was of *grace* and not of *debt.*

3. But there is still another reason, (arising from the moral order of things,) why this *free gift*, if it were fit or necessary to be bestowed on *condition*, should rather be annexed to a *positive* than a *moral* duty. No one, I suppose, was ever so wild as to imagine, that had Adam not eaten of the FORBIDDEN FRUIT, he would have been intitled to *immortality*, unless he had likewise observed the dictates of

* See the subject of the DIVINE LEGATION.

the MORAL LAW, which *natural Religion* enjoins; the habitual violation of which, unrepented of, every reflecting man sees, must have deprived him of *immortality*, as inevitably as the transgression of the *positive command*. The reason is evident. Man living under the *Law of Nature*, when the *free gift of immortality* was bestowed on him, his previous qualification to fit him for the acceptance of the free gift, must needs be *some reward*; or, in other words, his having a claim to *that* REWARD which *Natural Religion* bestows. Now nothing but the observance of *moral duties* could intitle him to *some reward*. The consequence is, that the observance of moral duties was a condition *annexed by nature*, and appropriated to that *reward* which follows the favour of God in general; and so could not be made the condition of a *different* thing, viz. *the free gift of immortality*, which was founded in a prior capacity of *reward*; and this capacity acquired by the performance of moral duties.

These things give the curious observer such exalted ideas of divine Wisdom, in the order and course of God's Dispensations to Man, that (transported with the idea) I have anticipated a *Truth*, which, though it be of present use to confirm what hath been already said concerning the separate states, and different genius of *Natural* and *Revealed* Religion, yet belongs more properly to another place; where I shall employ it to remove a difficulty which hath so long *entangled*, that it hath at length *discredited* the most rational as well as essential Principle of Christianity.

In the mean time, we see, to how little purpose Divines have fatigued themselves, and others, to give a reason, Why a *positive* and not a *moral* duty was made the condition of *immortal life*. In the course of which enquiry, some have been so extravagant as to assert, that the sequestered state of the first Pair made the observance of a *moral duty* an improper condition to be annexed to this *free gift*; seeing, in that state, opportunities were wanting to exercise them. But, if we divide moral duty, as is commonly done, into the three separate Branches, of *Divine*, *Personal*, and *Social*, we shall find that Adam had as equal occasion to practise the two first, as if sent into a World filled with Inhabitants; and the most meritorious part of the third, as soon as ever he was blessed with *a Help meet for him*.*

The truth is, the State of *Natural Religion*, under which Adam lived till he was put into *Paradise*, unobserved by Divines; and the mistaken ideas entertained of it, by them, when they had observed it, and distinguished it from the *Revealed*, betrayed them into these absurdities, and gave birth (as we shall see hereafter) to a thousand errors, which have obscured and deformed the glories of that last great

* Gen. ii. 18.

and best Work in God's moral government, THE REDEMPTION OF MANKIND BY THE SACRIFICE OF HIS SON.

From the account here given, God's JUSTICE, with regard to the effects of Adam's transgression upon his Posterity, is fully declared. Adam fell, and forfeited the *free gift* of immortality—*in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.** He returned to his former state in which he was created, subject to mortality; *that death* which follows the separation of soul and body. It is astonishing that any *other death* should have been understood by those words,† when the very *sentence of condemnation* itself confines us to the sense here given—*In the sweat of thy face* (says God) *shalt thou eat bread, till* THOU RETURN UNTO THE GROUND: *for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and* UNTO DUST SHALT THOU RETURN.‡

In this State, Adam begot a *Posterity*, which naturally became sharers in his original condition of *Mortality*.§ And, Were they injured in not being made partakers of a gift never bestowed upon them? Absurd! They were left and continued in possession of all the Rights inherent in their original nature; and would have had the benefit of the FREE GIFT, had not he, to whom it was given, and from whom they were descended, forfeited it before they came into Being.‖ What *Physical* contagion they contracted at their birth, either of body or of mind, is of little use to enquire; since, however Man came by his Malady, his cure is one and the same.

So good reason had St. Paul not to think he impeached the *Justice* of God, when he said, that DEATH *reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who had* NOT SINNED AFTER THE SIMILITUDE *of Adam's transgression*,¶ i. e. over those who died before they came to the knowledge of good and evil. Now, as the *death*, here mentioned, could be only Physical, though total; the *death* spoken of, in the same sentence, as denounced on the rest of mankind, who had *sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression*, must, consequently, be Physical likewise.

Thus both infants and adults falling under the very letter of the sentence denounced on Adam, we see how God's justice is made apparent.

Another important truth emerges from this account of the FALL, viz. that this part of the Mosaic History is NO ALLEGORY, as hath

* Gen. ii. 17. † See note C, at the end of this book. ‡ Gen. iii. 19.
§ "By *death*" (says Mr. Locke) "some men understand, *endless torments in Hell-fire*.—But it seems a strange way of understanding a Law, (which requires the plainest and directest words,) that by *death* should be meant, *eternal life in misery*. Can any one be supposed, by a Law, which says, *for felony thou shalt surely die*—not that he should lose his life, but be kept alive in perpetual and exquisite torments? And would any one think himself fairly dealt with that was so used?"—"Reasonableness of Christianity," vol. ii. p. 508. ‖ See what is said concerning the difference between the forfeiture of natural and adventitious Rights. "Divine Legation," book v. sect. 5.
¶ Rom. v. 14. See also note D, at the end of this book.

been commonly imagined. The root of which conceit, as indeed of many other extravagances that have deformed the rational simplicity of the Christian Faith, hath been the confounding the distinct and different sanctions of *natural* and *revealed* Religion with one another. For Divines, as we said, having mistaken these sanctions to be the same, namely IMMORTALITY, they were led to conclude, though against the express words of the text, that Adam's transgression was a breach of some precept of the MORAL LAW, and, consequently, that the account which represented it as the violation of a *positive Command*, was an ALLEGORY: and being once got upon this fairy-ground, every man had it in his power to pursue, as he liked, the favourite Vision, which he himself had raised from an *Allegory* left unexplained by the sacred Writer. Numberless have been these monsters of the Imagination. But a late Allegorist of the history of the *fall* hath so discredited the trade, by his absurd and abominable fancies, fit only to be told by himself,* that were it not for the account which both believers and unbelievers find in this commodious method of evading difficulties, we might hope at length to get free of the dishonour of having so long abused a rational mode of information.

We have shewn what the last *believing* Writer hath invented, to render the abuse *odious*; let us now see what the last *unbelieving* Writer hath offered to render the abuse *ridiculous*. He assures us, that the Scripture account of the FALL *is a* MERE ALLEGORY, *in the manner of the eastern Fables, signifying that man was formed to a state of happiness and perfection, which he enjoyed as long as he continued innocent, but lost and forfeited it by following his lusts and passions, in opposition to the will of his Creator; and became miserable as soon as he became a wilful and habitual sinner.*†

Here we see the learned Doctor throws aside his usual reserve, and preaches up rank DEISM without disguise: while he makes the FALL from, and RESTORATION to, life, as taught in the *Old* and *New Testament*, to be nothing more than an *Emblem* of the frail Condition of Man, to whom God had given the LAW OF NATURE for his only guide. On this principle he attacks Dr. Waterland's and Bishop Sherlock's explanations of the story of the FALL. But the force of his reasoning (as hath been the good fortune of most deistical Writers) springs not from the truth of his own notions, but from the futility of his Adversary's.—"Pray tell us," (says the learn d Doctor, with that vivacity which he never restrained, when he had his Adversary at advantage,) "What is it we Christians are obliged to believe of it? [the story of the *Fall*.] Must we believe it to be all an *Alle-*

* See "the Memoirs of the Life of Mr. W. Whiston," vol. i. p. 339. † DR. MIDDLETON'S "Works," 4to. vol. ii. p. 131, and vol. iii. p. 199.

gory? No. It is the allegorical interpretation that has drawn all this clamour from me, of weakening the authority of Moses and favouring infidelity. Must we believe it to be all *literal?* No. We are not allowed to do that, since there is certainly much *mystery* in it. What then are we to do? Why we are to consider it as neither fact nor fable, neither literal nor allegorical; to interpret one sentence *literally;* the next *allegorically;* the third again *literally;* and so on to the end of the chapter; which, like the very Serpent it treats of, is all over spotted and speckled; here with *letter*, there with *mystery;* and sometimes, with a dash of both."*

This, on a supposition, (the truth of which, both the Deist and the Believer took for granted) that the Mosaic account of the FALL was an ALLEGORY, hath its weight. But none at all, on the supposition, whose truth I have endeavoured to evince, that the Mosaic account is a HISTORY OF FACT, and not, as the learned Doctor pretends, A MERE ALLEGORY; interlarded, indeed, as the ancient Histories of greatest weight have always been, with strong figurative expressions, as well *allegorical* as *metaphorical*. In such a kind of composition, the best rules of interpretation not only justify the rational Critic in understanding some expressions *literally* and others *allegorically*, but necessarily require his observance of this rule. To do what the learned Doctor requires of him—To stick throughout, either to the *letter* or the *figure*, would betray much ignorance of the genius of ancient literature. When Adam is said to have *eaten of forbidden fruit*, and *Israel to have committed whoredom*, Do these phrases (used by the same Historian in his History of the *Fall*, and afterwards in the History of the Jewish *Defection)* make one more an ALLEGORY than the other? Are not both narratives of facts *figuratively* adorned? the first, to denote *Adam's transgression of a positive Command;* and the other, to signify *the defection of the Israelites into Idolatry*.

The cold raillery, therefore, of our learned Doctor, while he considers the Mosaic Account of the FALL, *as neither fact nor fable, neither literal nor allegorical, but to be sometimes interpreted one way, sometimes another*—might, for his credit, have been spared; as informing us of nothing but his inattention to, or ignorance of, literary composition, as it was in its primeval state; early formed, and still continuing to exist, amongst People undisciplined by arts and polished manners.

The truth is, our Critic in his censure, and those learned Divines in their defence, have equally confounded two distinct Species of Writing with one another; that is to say, an ALLEGORY with a real HISTORY ornamented with metaphorical and allegorical colouring.

* See the Doctor's "Defence" of his Letter to Waterland.

The Divines, to serve their occasions, did it, either wittingly or inadvertently; and the learned Doctor, to serve his, either followed their example or imitated their practice. These Divines had observed, that preceding Commentators on the Bible had, occasionally, in the narrative parts, *jumped from the literal to the allegoric sense, and so backward and forward to the end of the Chapter*, because they found, that where the language was full of *figurative* terms, it was reasonable and necessary so to do. Their error was, in supposing they might do the same, in what they believed to be an ALLEGORY. On the other hand, our Doctor saw the absurdity of this practice in an *Allegory;* but his error was, in supposing it to be equally absurd to do the same in a *figurative* narration of fact.

And what occasioned the common mistake of both parties was, their having (as we say) confounded these two species of Composition with one another; which they would never have done, had they but considered, that the end of an ALLEGORY is to *hide*, and the purpose of allegorical, that is figurative expressions, only to *ornament*.

But, as the History of the *Fall* is, in Dr. Middleton's sense, a MERE ALLEGORY, and as his MORAL of the *Fable* tends to reduce the whole Doctrine of the Gospel to MERE DEISM; I shall now endeavour to shew, from the *very genius of Antiquity*, that *his Moral* is not of the nature of those which the most early times loved to disguise under that cover.

It is, in the learned Doctor's opinion, A MERE ALLEGORY, *in the manner of the eastern Fables, signifying, that Man was formed to a state of happiness and perfection; which he enjoyed as long as he continued innocent, but lost and forfeited it by following his lusts and passions, and so became miserable.*

The truth of his idea, of its being a MERE ALLEGORY, hath been examined already. But this is not the whole of his idea: It is, if you will believe him, *in the* MANNER OF THE EASTERN FABLES.

An observation that betrays his ignorance both of *Eastern Fables* and *Eastern Truths*. The *Fables* of the Ancients, whether of the East or West, were invented, as I have shewn elsewhere, for this end, and for no other, namely, to hide from the People, under that cover, such *Truths* as were above the People's capacity to comprehend; or were judged inexpedient, for the sake of public utility, that they should know. This Veil, however, their Wise Men were able to penetrate; and so could benefit themselves of all the Truth conveyed under it; and the Public, of just so much as was judged expedient for them to be made acquainted with.

But what pretence is there to say, that either of these causes of concealment had any place in the MORAL, which the Doctor is pleased to tell us is conveyed under the *fable of the Fall*. The *Moral* con-

tains a Truth of the utmost clearness, and most general use; whose publication could be of no possible disservice to Society, or be abused by one single individual in it.

On the other hand, if, instead of this MORAL, of *a simple lapse from innocence to guilt*, we believe that Jesus and his Apostles have rightly interpreted the Mosaic account of the FALL, where they inform us of the specific nature of the loss which Adam sustained thereby; and if, from the nature and course of God's Dispensations, we see the fitness of its remaining a *Mystery* for many ages, that *Mystery* which (the Apostle tells us) *was hid from ages and generations, but was at length made manifest to the Saints;** if this, I say, were the case, then, indeed, though the Doctor's *Moral* required none of this Cover to his MERE ALLEGORY: yet such a Cover very well suited the History of Moses; and justified the interpretation of the Apostles.

Thus the POSITIVE COMMAND, whatever it specifically was, is contained in the words of *not eating of the Fruit of the tree of good and evil*—the TEMPTER, THE EVIL BEING, is shadowed under the *Serpent*—and the CONDEMNATION TO DEATH, by Adam's return to his first state of MORTALITY.

Having thus cleared the revealed Doctrine of the FALL from the absurdity of this deistical interpretation, I now go on with my Subject.

Man, having forfeited the *free gift of Immortality*, is driven out of *Paradise*, and returned back to the state and condition in which he was created, a Subject only of NATURAL RELIGION. With this difference, that, before his entrance into Paradise, he was altogether ignorant of the extent of his finite duration: on his expulsion from thence, he might learn, from the terms of his *Sentence*, that the execution of it, by DEATH, was at no great distance.—*In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*†

But when we speak of the two Religions, *natural* and *revealed*, we must distinguish (in our use of the term, REVELATION) between a *System* of revealed Religion, and an occasional Communication of the divine Will to Man, for his conduct on particular points, or for his comfort in general, when the course of God's moral government required that he should, from time to time, have intimations given to him, more or less obscurely, of the hidden purpose of Providence in his favour; and this, through various Dispensations, till, at the final completion of them, *life and immortality* should be again *brought to light* and restored. These occasional Communications began with that contained in the Sentence denounced on the *Serpent*, or the EVIL

* Col. i. 26. † Gen. iii. 19.

ONE, that *the Seed of the Woman should bruise his head; and that he should bruise its heel:** And ended with that given by the mouth of Jacob, *that the Sceptre should not depart from Judah, nor a Lawgiver from between his feet, until* SHILOH *should come, to whom the gathering of the People should be.*†

What followed these occasional Communications was that SECOND SYSTEM of *Revealed Religion*, delivered to the Posterity of *Abraham*, by Moses, preparatory to the THIRD and last, under the Reign or rule of *Shiloh*, or JESUS CHRIST, which took in and embraced the whole Posterity of *Adam*.

So that, of *Revelations*, in the sense of REVEALED SYSTEMS of RELIGION, there were but THREE: the *first*, given to *Adam* when placed in Paradise; the *second*, to the Posterity of Abraham, when going (under the ministry of *Moses*) to possess the *promised Land;* and the *third*, promulged to all Mankind, by *Jesus the Messiah*.

Ignorance, of this matter, made the Rabbins invent a fanciful *System of Revealed Religion* as given to the *Sons of Noah*, under the name of the SEVEN PRECEPTS.—So that it seemed proper just to hint at this *distinction;* which, for want of attending to, hath been the occasion of much error and mistake.

We have now seen MAN under the two first States of God's Moral Government, the *natural* and the *revealed;* and how, by his misconduct in the *second*, he was returned back again to the *first;* in which he remained throughout the long interval from Adam to Moses; when, by this time, the NATURAL LAW was become so viciated, and obscured, that all memory of the LAWGIVER was lost and forgotten. So that the knowledge of the one true God, on which all *natural* as well as *revealed* Religion is founded, was, of necessity, to be REPUBLISHED to the world, by MOSES, when he entered on his Mission; who not only rekindled its extinguished flame, but, by the *Dispensation* committed to his care, in which the *first Cause* constantly and immediately directs all things, obviated the like misfortune for the future.

And as this Dispensation, called the LAW, being the prelude and preparation to the GOSPEL, whose Author was the promised MESSIAH, the Restorer of what was lost in Adam, could be only made intelligible by the previous knowledge of the *cause* and *nature* of that loss, therefore hath Moses studiously recorded that previous Knowledge.

And here it will be proper to observe, that had Jesus been only a MESSENGER sent from heaven, with no other purpose than to propagate a System of revealed Morals, or to *republish* the Law of Nature, we can see no reason why LIFE AND IMMORTALITY might not have been promulged by MOSES for the Sanction of the *Law*, as well as by

* Gen. iii. 15. † Gen. xlix. 10.

JESUS CHRIST, who hath made it the peculiar Sanction of the *Gospel:* and so both Doctrines, that of the *true God,* and of *eternal life,* have come from Heaven together. The SOCINIANS, and they who deny a REDEMPTION by the *Atonement* of a REAL SACRIFICE *on the Cross,* would do well to re-consider this matter. But more of it in a fitter place.

To proceed. By the Penalty inflicted on Adam he (with all his Posterity) was again made *mortal;* that is, became EXTINCT, at the natural dissolution of the union between Soul and Body.

But that *distribution* of reward and punishment, which God, under every mode of his Moral Government, makes, with supreme justice, either here in this world, or hereafter in another, was (when the sentence of DEATH was denounced on Man's Transgression) at first made here in this world, so long as he continued to be favoured with the administration of an equal or extraordinary Providence. Which, as we learn from the Mosaic History, continued from the FALL down to the time when Polytheism universally prevailed. For, when the World, by reason of the Vices and Corruptions of its inhabitants, *did not like to retain God in their knowledge, but changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into an Image made like to corruptible Man,** that first dispensation of Providence was withdrawn.

Yet, as soon as God had selected a *chosen Race,* and had separated it from the rest of Mankind, *to place his name there,* we see, with astonishment, this *equal Providence* revive in Judea; for Man was still under the *Curse* or *doom of death.* And this existed, till repeated Idolatries, the crime which first caused the *equal Providence* to be withdrawn from the Nations at large, did at length deprive the *chosen People,* likewise, of their share of this blessing.

And, by such time as they had invariably returned from their Apostacy to the pure worship of the *God of their Fathers,* the Course of God's moral government required, that the nature and genius of the GOSPEL (the Religion which compleated all the foregoing, and which, by the recovery of what was lost in Adam, made an *equal Providence* no longer necessary) was gradually revealed unto them. This, as we say, superseded the use, and prevented the return, of that *equal Providence;* which, otherwise, on their adherence to the God of Israel, and perseverance in his worship, they might naturally have expected. Nay, the full conviction of their recent loss, joined to the scattered lights in the later Prophets, together with other less legitimate helps, enabled them to gather and arrange their ideas in favour of a FUTURE STATE; as hath been shewn at large in the foregoing Books.

These *lights* Divine Providence, in its course, did indulge to them,

* Rom. i. 23—28.

till the *Sun of Righteousness* arose, lest the sudden splendour of his appearance should totally dazzle this blinded and devoted people; who, thus indulgently prepared and made fit to receive the Gospel, were, by their rejection of it, rendered totally without excuse.

These observations, the Reader sees, add further evidence to the Truths advanced in the former Books, concerning this EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE.

The course of my Argument, in those Books, led me to deduce an equal administration of Providence in the Jewish State, from the Nature of its THEOCRACY. My Subject here leads me to shew, from the general ORDER of God's Moral Government, that this *equal Providence* was administered in the world at large, while it retained the memory of the true God; and was again administered in the Land of Judea, when, by the Mission of Moses, the true God had there regained his rights.

All this, when carefully considered, will, amongst a variety of other reasoning, be one incontestible proof of the truth of REVEALED RELIGION. Here, in the MOSAIC, we find it so contrived, by divine Skill, that the peculiar Nature of the œconomy, under a THEOCRACY, should coincide with, and concur to support, that very dispensation of Providence which naturally arose from the punishment of the FALL. This also will add strength and light to all my former reasoning, for the extension of this *extraordinary Providence* to PARTICULARS. For now it is seen, that this dispensation was not merely political and attendant on a *Theocracy*, where civil considerations often overlook the care of individuals; but it was a general dispensation of Religion, from the FALL to the time when idolatry over-ran the World: and was again administered when and where the knowledge and worship of the true God was restored.

"It is true" (may an objector reply), "that this *different* administration of Providence, between the faithful followers of the true God, and the careless apostates from his worship, did preserve the dignity due to God's Moral Government; yet still this difference appears to be so great, that it looks like an impeachment of the divine Attributes, to confine this benefit to such only, *who liked to retain God in their knowledge*, while the rest of Mankind were left and abandoned to the evils consequent on an irregular and unequal administration of Providence."

This objection would have weight, if those who were included under the Sentence passed on Adam should be irremissibly doomed to the short existence of this mortal life. But a secret REPRIEVE (kept hid, indeed, from the early world) passed along with the *Sentence of Condemnation*. So that they who never received their due in *this* World, would still be kept in existence till they had received it in the

next: such being, in no other sense, sufferers by the administration of an unequal Providence, than in being ignorant of the reparation which attended them. For we learn, from sacred Writ (what the principles of natural Reason do not impeach) that the DEATH of Christ had a retrospect from the FALL of Adam; and that REDEMPTION was, from the first, amongst the principal Ingredients in God's Moral Government of Man.

Now, if the *goodness* of God thus provided for human *redemption*, that *goodness*, joined to his *justice*, would make the *redemption* as extensive as the forfeiture. But, in case a *retrospect* did not take place, it would not be thus extensive. More words would only obscure a truth, which the sacred text hath rendered so plain and clear.

Ye were redeemed (says St. Peter) *with the precious blood of Christ*, FOREORDAINED *from the foundation of the World, but was* MANIFEST *in these last times for you.** St. John explains, from the words of Jesus himself, what is to be understood by his being *foreordained*, viz. That it was receiving the *glory* which accompanies the entrance on an high office—*And now, O Father,* GLORIFY *me, with the* GLORY *which I had with thee before the World was. I have* MANIFESTED *thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the World.*†

St. Peter, in the words above, distinguisheth between the *advent* of our *Redeemer*, and the *efficacy* of his death, in teaching us, that though his MANIFESTATION was late, yet the virtue of his FOREORDAINED *Redemption* operated from the most early times. For it would be trifling to speak of a *pre-ordination*, which was not to be understood of a *pre-operation;* since those to whom the Apostle wrote well understood, from the Attributes of the Godhead, that all things *that were*, had been *pre-ordained*, in the simple sense of the word. The other sense, of a *pre-operation*, St. John more forcibly expresses, *by the Lamb* SLAIN *from the foundation of the World.*‡

But if the course of God's various Dispensations required, that this *Act of grace*, the REDEMPTION, should be *kept hid for Ages*, and never fully revealed till the *Advent* of his SON, it could not be otherwise, than that, in the *intermediate Dispensations*, Mankind must be still represented as suffering under the forfeiture of Adam; in Scripture language called, *lying under the curse:* Nor had such of Adam's Posterity any cause to complain that the REDEMPTION was kept hid from them, since it was an Act of *Grace*, and not of *Debt*, of which they would finally, and in due time, have the benefit. In the interim, as hath been shewn above, the moral government of God, revealed to us in Scripture, was administered to them in such a manner, as, sooner or later, to proclaim its perfect equity.

* 1 Peter i. 19, 20. † John xvii. 5, 6. ‡ Rev. xiii. 8. See also note E, at the end of this book.

CHAPTER II.

In this manner did the FREE GIFT OF IMMORTALITY become forfeit, by Man's violating the CONDITION on which it was bestowed. For a GIFT is not the less *free* by having a *condition* annexed unto it: the quality of a *free gift* not arising from its being without *condition*, but from its being without a *claim of right*.

It is true, that a *Condition*, annexed to a *claim of right*, is of a different nature from *that* which the Governor of the world hath seen fit to annex to a *free gift*: the first ariseth out of the settled constitution of things; the second depends on arbitrary will and pleasure. Thus MORAL VIRTUE was the *condition* of that favour and protection which the *Creature*, Man, *claims* from his Maker; but the OBSERVANCE OF A POSITIVE COMMAND was the *condition* of the *free gift of immortality*.

Again, the *Law of Nature* informs us, that the *Condition*, which accompanies a *claim*, is, when unperformed, still capable of recovering its efficacy: the same *Law* likewise directs us to the *means*, namely, REPENTANCE. But the violated Condition, annexed to a *free gift*, is not thus recoverable.

The reason of this difference is apparent. God's Creatures have a claim to his favour and protection, whenever, and as often as, the breach of the *Condition* is repaired by sincere *repentance*; because the relation between the Creator and Creature makes the *claim* indissolvable. But IMMORTALITY being a *free gift*, which gift that *relation* doth not naturally infer; when the condition, on which it was bestowed, is broken, the benefit is irrecoverably taken back. The consequence of which is, that if God, in his infinite goodness, shall be pleased to restore again that *free gift*, he may do it by what *means* he sees fit, as not being confined to *that* which his own establishment hath prescribed, for the recovery of his *favour* and *protection* simply.

The *means*, therefore, of regaining the *free gift of immortality*, when God had graciously decreed that it should be regained, can be only known by REVELATION.

Another specific difference between the *Conditions* annexed to a *grace*, and to a *claim*, is this, that as the condition of the former is the observance of an *arbitrary Command*, this Command may not be the same (though still arbitrary, as annexed to a *free gift*) when that grace is *restored*, with what it was in the *first donation*. It was not the same; as we shall see when we come to speak of the *condition of life and immortality* again *brought to light*. Where we shall, at the same time, be enabled to see God's gracious purpose in the *Change*.

But here let us always keep in mind (which not to do will occasion much confusion in handling the subject of REDEMPTION), that the MEANS of recovering a benefit lost, and the CONDITION annexed to that benefit, when recovered, are two very distinct and different things. Both of which, viz. of the MEANS and the CONDITION, we shall speak to in their Order.

And first of the MEANS; and to Whom intrusted.

The MEANS employed in this great Work, the REDEMPTION OF MANKIND, human reason alone was not sufficient to discover.

It may, indeed, be collected from the Principles of *Natural Religion* (as we have more than once observed, and cannot do it too often) that God, on the sincere repentance of Offenders, will receive them again into favour, and render them capable of those rewards *naturally* attendant on right behaviour. But the case before us is very different. The benefit lost by Adam's transgression was *a free gift*, a matter of grace. Our restoration, therefore, to that benefit must needs be of *grace* likewise; consequently, the *means* resided in the hidden counsels of the Bestower, and so not to be found in the promulged Digest of *Natural Law*.

He might have *restored* us, and certainly would, had he seen it best, on the common terms on which *Natural Religion* assureth us he will receive returning Sinners to his favour: or he might, with equal justice, in perfecting the great work of *Redemption*, require MORE; namely, a MEDIATION, enforced by some kind of SATISFACTION. But what his good pleasure was herein, it was impossible for human Reason to discover; whatever fitness that Reason may perceive in these MEANS, when revealed.

Indeed, had it been decent for fallen Man, aided only by the glimmering light of that indefinite promise, that he should some time or other be restored to his lost inheritance; had it been decent, I say, to indulge his conjectures concerning the Counsels of the Most High, he would have been apt to think that a MEDIATOR might be employed amongst the *means* used in this *Restoration;* since he is able to see the same fitness of such an interposition in matters of *grace*, as of *repentance alone* in matters of *right*. MEDIATION implying a confession, that the thing requested is merely of *grace;* to the obtaining of which, Man doth no further co-operate than by his hopes and wishes.

How reasonable such a conclusion would have been we find by this, that the very MEANS, here supposed, have been, as we have said, in *fact*, used, and accepted by the God of our Salvation.—*For there is one God*, (says St. Paul) *and one* MEDIATOR *between God and Man, the Man Jesus Christ.**—*Jesus* (says the Author of the Epistle to the

* 1 Tim. ii. 5.

Hebrews) *is the* MEDIATOR *of a better Covenant, which was established upon better promises.**

The modesty of *Reason* finds its account in Conclusions thus confirmed; and the Truth of *Scripture* receives light and strength from Conclusions thus made.

We are now to consider of the Person of this *Mediator*, and then enquire into the manner in which he discharged his *Mediation*.

The eternal Son of God, Jesus, the Messiah, was the Person appointed to this Office.† The time of his appearance was foretold by the Jewish Prophets: and the nearer they lived to that time, the clearer and fuller were their intimations concerning the Character and Fortunes of him, who was sent to REDEEM Israel, and *to bring* again *to light* that *life and immortality* which was lost by the transgression of Adam.

The manner in which he was to discharge his MEDIATION, is our next enquiry: whether he did it simply by INTERCEDING for the remission of the Forfeiture; or whether by SATISFYING, at the same time, for the Debt? is the Question. Now, as it rested in God's good pleasure, which of these he would accept, we must again have recourse to Scripture for information: where we find that the *intercession* was by way of SATISFACTION for the Debt.

This *Satisfaction* is called in Scripture, REDEMPTION; a term taken from civil transactions amongst Men, where the things or persons *redeemed* were paid for, with a price. Hence St. Paul, speaking of our Redemption from the forfeiture of Adam, expresseth it by this Periphrasis, *Ye are bought with a price.*‡

The *price* paid was the DEATH of the Son of God. *Christ died for the ungodly,*§ says he. And again, *Christ died for our Sins* ‖—*he died for all* ¶—*to obtain salvation, our Lord Jesus Christ died for us.*** On this account, and in allusion to the like transactions amongst Men, the *Redeemer* is called the LORD of those whom he *redeemed*—*For to this end* (says he) *Christ both died and rose and revived, that he might be the* LORD *both of the dead and living.*††

And now let us proceed to the nature of that DEATH which had the efficacy of REDEMPTION.

1. First, it must be VOLUNTARY—*Hereby we perceive the love of God, because he laid down his life for us,*‡‡ says St. John.—*I lay down my life for the Sheep,* (saith Jesus himself) *no man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down; and I have power to take it again. This* COMMANDMENT *have I received of my Father.*§§ Here he represents the *laying down his*

* Heb. viii. 6. † See the note F, at the end of this book. ‡ 1 Cor. vi. 20.
§ Rom. v. 6. ‖ 1 Cor. xv. 3. ¶ 2 Cor. v. 15. ** 1 Thess. v. 9, 10.
†† Rom. xiv. 9. ‡‡ 1 John iii. 16. §§ John x. 15—18.

life as a *power* bestowed, in consequence of a *Command* received. And this will lead us to consider

2. The second requisite of a *voluntary* death efficacious of *redemption;* which is, that it must be OFFERED UP, in consequence of preordained *acceptance*, called, in the text, a COMMAND. And what is a religious *offering up* to God, but a SACRIFICE?

In this sense (the proper sense of the word,) the holy Scriptures expressly call the death of Christ a SACRIFICE. St. Paul speaking (as is his wont) in the Language of the LAW,* says,—*Christ our Passover is* SACRIFICED *for us.*† The Writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who rarely speaks any other Language, says—*Christ needeth not daily, as those high Priests, to offer up* SACRIFICE, *first for his own sins, and then for the People's; for this he did once when he* OFFERED UP HIMSELF.‡ Again—*Christ hath appeared to put away sin, by the* SACRIFICE OF HIMSELF.§ And again—*He was once* OFFERED *to bear the sins of many.*‖

But the virtue of *expiatory Sacrifices* consisted in procuring ATONEMENT, by some sort of SATISFACTION. And thus the expiatory Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross operated for our REDEMPTION.

One could hardly have thought it possible, that any Man, who had read the *Gospels*, with their best interpreters, the Authors of the *Epistles*, should ever have entertained a doubt, WHETHER THE DEATH OF CHRIST WAS A REAL SACRIFICE?

But mistaken notions, concerning the *origin* and *nature* of this sacred Rite, have so obscured the *Rationale* of it, that the SOCINIANS, who boast to have Interpreted Scripture on the severest and justest Laws of Logic and Criticism, have, in this instance, as well as in many others, deviated more from these Laws than the most licentious of the *Allegorists*, or the wildest of the *Spiritualizers*. Here, in their care to avoid an imaginary absurdity, they have fallen into a real one, and of the grossest kind, while they consider the *death of Christ* as nothing more than THE SEAL OF HIS MISSION. For, were this all, so bloody an Impression might have been well spared; since the *proper Seal of his Mission*, or the evidence of his being SENT, were MIRACLES performed and PROPHECIES fulfilled. His DYING, if it were only in support of what he taught, could be nothing more than the *seal of his Integrity*.

But Ignorance of the ORIGIN AND NATURE OF SACRIFICE hath

* To this an objector may reply,—*if St. Paul speaks in the Language of the Law*, why is not the word *Sacrifice* part of that language, as well as *Passover?* And if so, says such a one, your argument from this text, in proof of a *real Sacrifice*, is enervated. To this I answer, the *language of the law* may extend to *names* without extending to *things*. It plainly does so, here. The word *Passover* is language peculiar to the *Law:* the word SACRIFICE, though the language of the *Law*, is not peculiar to it, but in use throughout the whole religious World to denote a *Rite*, common, at that time, to all Men. † 1 Cor. v. 7. ‡ Heb. vii. 27. § Heb. ix. 26. ‖ Verse 28.

misled these our *Rationalists* into the gross and semipagan errors concerning the *Rite* itself. And therefore it will be expedient to give (though it may prove a work of some length and labour) an enlarged History of this whole matter.

As SACRIFICE is almost coeval with the human Race, its nature and supposed effects depend on the knowledge of its *Original;* which is only to be found in the notions, habits, and customs of the first mortals.

The PRINCIPLE advanced in the fourth Section of the fourth Book of this work, together with the reasoning on that *Principle* concerning the ANCIENT MODE OF CONVERSE BY ACTION IN AID OF WORDS, will lead us (so prolific is that Principle, in laying open the most secret treasures of Antiquity) to the true *rationale* of this widely extended, and as widely mistaken, *Rite of Sacrifice.* This will shew, how the common sentiments of our Nature would draw the first Men into this mode of worship, whether the SACRIFICE WAS EUCHARISTICAL, PROPITIATORY, or EXPIATORY. Under one or other of these Classes, I suppose, all sorts of *Sacrifice* may be reasonably comprized. Though the Egyptians, we are told, extended the number to six hundred sixty and six. But their Sacrifices, like their Kings, were wantonly multiplied at pleasure, in defiance of time and truth, to fit the purpose of every fabling or designing Priest. For, the Sentiments which nature and reason excite in every pious breast towards the Author and Support of our Being, are simply these, *Gratitude* for good bestowed; *Application* to him for good sought or wanted; and *Repentance* for, and deprecation of, Crimes committed.

1. Gratitude gave birth to *Eucharistical Sacrifice.* And this duty was, in the most early times, discharged in EXPRESSIVE ACTION; the least equivocal of which was, the Offerer's bringing the first fruits of Pasturage or Agriculture, to that sequestered place, where the Deity used to be more solemnly invoked, at the stated times of religious Worship; and there, presenting them in homage, with a demeanour which spoke to this purpose—"I do hereby acknowledge thee, O my God! to be the Author and giver of all good: and do now, with humble gratitude, return my warmest thanks for these thy blessings, particularly bestowed upon me."

Things, thus devoted, became, from thenceforth, sacred. And to prevent their *desecration,* the readiest way was to send them to the Table of the Priest, or to consume them in the fire of the Altar.

2. The PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE was *precatory,* to implore success to their labours, in order to procure and improve to their use these common blessings of Providence; and *deprecatory,* to avert the evils due to the past abuse of such blessings. And in this species of Sacrifice, likewise, the oblation was so contrived as to be an *Action* equally

expressive of an invocation for the continuance of God's favour; and for the remission of the Offerer's transgressions.

3. But it is the third Sort, the EXPIATORY SACRIFICE, which, by reason of the horrid abuses it early underwent, hath obscured the whole face of things: yet the luciferous Principle, here applied, to illustrate this whole matter, shews EXPIATORY SACRIFICE to be, in its nature, as intelligible, and in practice as rational, as either of the other two. Here, instead of presenting the first fruits of agriculture and pasturage, in corn, wine, oil and wool, as in the *eucharistical*, or a portion of what was to be sown or otherwise propagated, as in the *propitiatory;* some chosen Animal, precious to the repenting Criminal, who deprecates, or supposed to be obnoxious to the Deity, who is to be appeased, was offered up and slain at the Altar, in an Action, which, in all languages, when translated into words, speaks to this purpose, —"I confess my transgressions at thy footstool, O my God! and, with the deepest contrition, implore thy Pardon; confessing that I deserve death for these my offences."—The latter part of the Confession was more forcibly expressed by the *Action* of striking the devoted animal, and depriving it of life; which, when put into words, concluded in this manner—"And I own that I myself deserve the death which I now inflict on this Animal."

But here it will be proper to observe, that as crimes of a lighter complexion were atoned for, as well as deprecated in the *propitiatory Sacrifice;* so those of a deeper dye could be only blotted out by the *expiatory*. This frequently brought into both the slaughter, or at least, the consecration of a devoted animal, by an action which spoke alike in each; but louder in the *expiatory;* while, in all the *three*, the *action of Sacrifice* still expressed a reasonable language.

But this system of Sacrifice, so well supported by what we know of plain and simple Nature, in its most early movements, is further realized by what Historians tell us was pronounced by the mouth of the Sacrificer himself; who frequently explained his own action by the words with which he accompanied it.

We learn from Antiquity, that when friendly or adverse States had entered into an alliance for mutual defence, or ended a war on mutual conditions, the League was solemnized by the two parties with the additional Sanction of a SACRIFICE, in its nature chiefly partaking of that species we call *Propitiatory;* to implore a blessing on the transaction.

The Historian, Livy, hath recorded the Ceremonies in use, in these Sorts of Sacrifice; where, speaking of a treaty concluded between the Roman and Alban People, on certain conditions mutually agreed upon, he tells us, that the Public person, on the part of Rome, whom we may call the *King at arms*, and who was the sacrificing Priest, when about

to strike the Victim, thus invocates their common God, in an address to the Alban People, and their chief Heralds—"Legibus deinde recitatis, Audi, inquit, *Jupiter;* audi *Pater patrate* Populi Albani; audi tu Populus Albanus; ut illa palam prima postrema ex illis Tabulis Cerave recitata sunt, sine dolo malo, utique ea hic hodie rectissime intellecta sunt, illis Legibus Populus Romanus prior non deficiet. Si prior defexit publico Consilio dolo malo, TU ILLO DIE, JUPITER, POPULUM ROMANUM SIC FERITO, UT EGO HUNC PORCUM HIC HODIE FERIAM, TANTOQUE MAGIS FERITO *quanto magis potes pollesque: Id ubi dixit, porcum saxo silice percussit.*" *

Another Treaty concluded between Hannibal and his Army of multifarious *Adventurers* was, the same historian tells us, sanctified in the like manner. Just before the battle of Trebia, the General, encouraging his Followers, by all the usual excitements, to do their duty, concludes with a promise of the most magnificent spoils, as the reward of their valour. And then offering one of those *propitiatory* Sacrifices for himself and his army; the better to induce the various nations, of which it was composed, to confide in his word, and rest assured of his good faith, he held out a Lamb ready for the Altar, and then proceeded in the following manner—"Eaque ut rata scirent fore, Agnum læva manu, dextra silicem retinens, SI FALLERET, JOVEM CÆTEROSQUE PRECATUS DEOS ITA SE MACTARENT QUEMADMODUM IPSE AGNUM MACTASSET. *Secundum precationem, Caput pecudis saxo elisit.*"†

We see the reason, why in these religious Acts, when made the Sanction of good faith, in public and civil conventions, the expressive *action* should be further ascertained by *Words.* It was necessary, in an affair of public and general importance, to give the utmost precision to the Act, by removing from it all doubtful or equivocal meaning.

Again, it is further worth our notice, that, although THE SPEAKING BY ACTION had (as we have shewn) its original in the defects and imperfection of early language; yet, even when those impediments to fuller information were in a good measure removed, still, partly from habit and custom, but principally from some advantages which this mode of converse had above the other, of speech, it was (as has been observed elsewhere) long kept up amongst People of simpler manners, especially in the more solemn transactions of life; of which those relating to religion were the chief: by reason, that *significative actions* make a stronger and more durable impression than *words;* as the Eye is a more certain and steady conveyance of intelligence than the Ear.

On the whole, the Reader now sees, that nothing could be more natural, intelligible, or rational, than *this mode of religious Worship,* as here explained.

* LIVIUS, lib. i. cap. 24. † Ibid. lib. xxi. cap. 45.

Ignorance of all this, and inattention to the state and condition of ancient times, have divided *Believers* into two parties on this subject.

One of them holds, that the origin of Sacrifices was by *command from Heaven;* the other, that it sprung from *Superstition*, together with many the like absurd practices. The first call this religious Rite *Mysterious:* and so give to *Heaven* what, in their opinion, *Reason* disclaims. *As to the origin of Sacrifices*, (says a learned Divine,) *it is extremely hard to conceive them to be a human Institution;* BECAUSE *we cannot give any tolerable account of the* REASONS *of them.** A more than *tolerable*, even a plain and clear *reason*, the Reader sees is now given. But men are always disposed to find in themselves a standard for the measure of all things. However, admit *Sacrifice* to be devoid of *Reason;* must things, thus circumstanced, needs come from Heaven? As if nothing had ever entered into Religion that was of the growth of Superstition! What will be the consequence of thus accounting for what we do not understand, but the disposing men to think, that every religious Rite, though palpably absurd, yet, if fancifully *mysterious*, had that original?

Another argument which this more orthodox Party urge for their Opinion, that Sacrifice must needs be heavenly-derived, is, perhaps, something more plausible, but equally inconclusive: It is the *very early use of Sacrifice*, which rises as high as the two Sons of Adam. And, indeed, our account of this *significative action* shews, that we can conceive no time, after the *Fall*, too early for its introduction amongst men, under the guidance and government of *natural Religion*, as these two Brothers certainly were: Besides, the defects of language, while in its early rudiments, necessarily occasioned this *mode* of intercourse between Man and his Maker. Yet, notwithstanding, Primæval use can never prove *Sacrifice* to have arisen from any other source than the light of *natural reason*. And if that be sufficient (as we have shewn it is), we must needs conclude that it arose from thence, when Scripture is silent concerning any other source. Especially since we find that this Scripture hath carefully recorded what *God* immediately, and not *nature*, taught to Adam and his Family. Now, concerning *Sacrifice*, there is not a single word which implies any such instruction. On the contrary, the manner in which the story is told leads us to conclude, that the Rite was first dictated by *natural reason.—Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a Tiller of the ground. And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground, an offering unto the Lord. And Abel he brought of the firstling of his flock.*†—*And* IN PROCESS OF TIME (says the Historian) IT CAME TO PASS, &c. words, which (in the sequel) not only acquaint us with the first Sacrificers, but in these, here quoted, strongly intimate, that

* SHUCKFORD. † Gen. iv. 2—4.

the *Rite* was of human original. While, throughout the whole narrative, we find no mention of any prescribed mode of *Patriarchal Sacrifice*, though Moses is most minute in what concerns the prescribed Sacrifices of the LAW. Doth not this shew, that the first was a voluntary, uncommanded worship, where the *mode* was left to the discretion of the Worshipper; and the latter a *prescribed* Rite, where every circumstance, in the celebration, was to be scrupulously observed?

Nor is this reasoning to be evaded by the confessed brevity of the sacred Historian. For had the Original of Sacrifice been prescribed, and directly commanded by the Deity, Moses could never have omitted the express mention of that circumstance. The two capital Observances in the Jewish Ritual were the SABBATH and SACRIFICES.—To impress the highest reverence and veneration on the *Sabbath*, the Historian is careful to record its divine Original in these words—*Thus the Heavens and the Earth were finished, and all the Host of them. And on the seventh day, God ended his Work, which he had made: and he* RESTED ON THE SEVENTH DAY *from all his work which he had made: and* GOD BLESSED THE SEVENTH DAY, AND SANCTIFIED IT: *because that in it, he had rested from all his Work, which God created and made.** Now, who can suppose, that, had SACRIFICE been of divine Original, Moses would have neglected to establish this truth, at the time that he recorded the other? Since it was of equal use, and of equal importance, with the other. I should have said of much greater: for the multifarious *Sacrifices* of the LAW had not only a reference to the *forfeiture* of Adam, but likewise prefigured our *Redemption* by Jesus Christ, as we shall shew hereafter.

The other mistaken extreme, arising from the same cause, namely, ignorance of the nature of Sacrifice, is amongst those Believers, who hold, that although Sacrifice became, at length, of *divine right*, yet, in its Origin, it was but a capricious Ordinance of human invention; concerning which, no rational or philosophic account can be given; yet, having spread wide, and struck its roots deep into the fat and lumpish Soil of Superstition, it was suffered, by God, to occupy a place in the Mosaic Institution, in compliance with the prejudices of a perverse and barbarous People, to whom many other extraneous Rites (perhaps irrational, but certainly harmless) were indulged.

And now, to go on with our History of Sacrifice. This important Rite, first dictated by natural reason, did not long continue in its original integrity.

Of all the customs in use amongst Men, those respecting Religion are most liable to abuse. For the passions of HOPE and FEAR become then most inordinate when the Mind is taken up and occupied in the offices of divine Worship. At this season, the sobriety of common

* Gen. ii. 1—3.

sense is often forced to give way to the extravagance of the imagination. And this more especially must have been the case in those early Ages, when undisciplined REASON was but just projecting how to curb the irregular sallies of Enthusiasm.

Add to this, that SACRIFICE being a *Scenical* Rite, it was principally fitted to strike the Fancy; which delighting in Paradox and Mystery, would riot in this enchanted ground, till it had lost sight of the simple meaning of a plain expressive action, first conceived for *use*, and continued out of *necessity*.

Under this state of delusion, *Eucharistical* and *propitiatory* Sacrifices were soon imagined to receive their chief value from the *costliness* of the offering; and HECATOMBS were supposed more acceptable to Heaven, than purity of mind, adorned with gratitude, and humble reliance on the Deity.

Amidst these disorders, *Philosophers* and *Moralists* might, from time to time, cry out, and ask, as they did, but without being heard,

> "Dicite, Pontifices, in Sacro quid facit Aurum?
> Quin damus id Superis, de magna quod dare lance
> Non possit magni Messalæ lippa propago:
> Compositum jus, fasque animi sanctosque recessus
> Mentis, et incoctum generoso pectus honesto?
> Hæc cedo, ut admoveam Templis, et farre litabo."*—

The world went on its Train; *and pomp of Sacrifice* was every where preferred to the *piety of the Offerer*.

But in *expiatory* Sacrifices, matters went still worse. For, in these, the passion of FEAR being predominant, strange enormities were soon superadded to the follies of the Worshippers.

In these, the offering of the slain animal began, first of all, to be vainly considered as a VICARIOUS ATONEMENT for the crimes of the Sacrificer.

Though, in the purity of the first Institution of Sacrifice, *striking* the devoted animal was an action naturally significative; which (as we said) when reduced to words, contained no more than this humble and contrite recognition—*I confess, O my God! that I deserve death for my transgressions.*

Modern Unbelievers, to get to their favourite point, which was to arraign the Mosaic Ritual for its *vicarious atonements*, have been very large in exposing this abuse in the offices of *Pagan* or of *Natural* Religion, corrupted. "Right reason" (say they) "disclaims all such atonements; and teaches, that to secure pardon for our offences against God, no more is required than humble confession before the throne of Grace, joined to a sincere purpose of amendment; so that all the *Mosaic*, as well as Pagan Sacrifices, which went on the idea of

* PERSIUS, *satyr.* ii.

a *vicarious atonement*, were merely human inventions of fraud or superstition."

But this charge against the LAW is founded either in ignorance or in ill faith. For though it may be true, that, by the *Law of Nature*, all *vicarious atonement* by Sacrifice is superfluous and absurd; yet, by the *Law of Moses*, it was rendered just and rational; for though this *Law* was founded, as all God's revelations are, on *natural Religion*, yet the Law, built thereupon, is conceived on the Principle of a FREE GIFT, long since forfeited by the breach of the Condition on which it was bestowed. This Principle, together with the *loss*, intimates the *recovery*. And further, in the institution of the *Rites of Sacrifice*, instructs us in the *means* employed for the recovery; *means* peculiar, and properly adapted, to the nature of a *free gift*.

We have already given, and shall further explain and justify, those *means* (namely, the VICARIOUS ATONEMENT, in the SACRIFICE ON THE CROSS, with its dependencies), on the grounds of Natural Reason and Religion.

To free, therefore, the *vicarious atonements*, in the Mosaic Sacrifices, from this Objection of our PHILOSOPHERS, it will be sufficient to observe these two things:

1. First, that the Mosaic Sacrifices were TYPES (and by both the Dispensations of the *Law* and *Gospel* declared to be so) of the great vicarious Sacrifice of the Cross: So that the justification of their use depends on their Prototype; whose conformity to right reason and equity will be shewn.

2. But then, in the second place, as these *Types* had a MORAL IMPORT,* that is, bore a temporal sense likewise, having a relation to the peculiar benefits enjoyed under a THEOCRACY, and so, of consequence, were not *Types* merely and solely of things to come, and to be transacted in another System, it will be necessary, in order to their full justification against the objections of our adversaries, to shew, that the *peculiar* benefits given by the LAW were of the nature of a FREE GIFT, like that of *immortality*, which was first bestowed on, and soon after lost by Adam in *Paradise*, and recovered by Jesus Christ in the *Gospel*. Between which two Dispensations, the LAW *came in* (as an intermediate Revelation,) and the benefits *peculiar* to the LAW (namely extraordinary *temporal blessings)* were so far of the nature of the FREE GIFT of immortality (their prototype,) as to make the MEANS of reconciliation for the violated condition, attendant on such a *Gift*, different from what is required for the transgressions which natural Religion condemns.

Thus have we put a fair end to this formidable objection, conceived in ignorance, and brought forth in iniquity.

* See these terms explained in the 6th book of this work, sect. v. pp. 190, 312.

But this is not all. The sacred Volume, which contains the Principles whereon *vicarious atonements* are justified, under the *Mosaic Law*, at the same time instructs us, that, by the LAW OF NATURE, a *vicarious atonement by sacrifice* is superstitious and absurd.

Moses, in pity of his People (whose idolatry, during his short absence, had so incensed the God of Israel, as to make it apprehended, by their Leader, that they would be totally abandoned, if not instantly destroyed), transported with the patriot passion, and misled by the Principles he had brought from Egypt, concerning VICARIOUS DEVOTEMENTS, thus addresses the Lord:—*Yet now, if thou wilt, forgive their sins: and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy Book which thou hast written.* To this the God of Israel replies (but on the principles of his own prior *Law*, the LAW OF NATURE; the *Ritual Law* being already planned, indeed, but not given and received),—"WHOEVER HATH SINNED AGAINST ME, HIM *will I blot out of my book.*"* As much as to say, "The *Law of Nature* allows not of *vicarious atonements;* but ordains, that the man who transgresseth shall himself bear the punishment of his iniquity; a punishment which no man deserves for the faults of another, unless he be partaker of the guilt, by joining in the transgression."

But self-love, aided by superstition, made men seek for pardon of their own Sins in the sufferings of others. When God gave the *Law of Nature*, he did not permit his Creatures to change the means he had ordained for pardon and reconciliation. But when he ordained the *Mosaic Law*, by which many benefits of *mere grace*, as well as others of *Debt*, were bestowed, he might, for breaches in the condition annexed to those of *mere grace*, well and equitably make the terms of pardon *different* from those he had before established for breaches in the condition annexed to those of *Debt*.

Thus we see how REVELATION triumphs; while every attack upon it produceth, in some new discovery of the amazing Wisdom in the various parts of the Dispensation, some further evidence of its Truth and Divinity. We have shewn with what superior sagacity, as well as indulgence, many harmless practices of Gentilism were introduced into the Mosaic Ritual. But to manifest to the World what use divine Wisdom can make even of the worst rubbish of Paganism, VICARIOUS SACRIFICES, condemned by the *Law of Nature*, as absurd and superstitious, it changed, when brought into the Mosaic Ritual, their very nature; and, in that revealed System, made them provisionary and reasonable.

And now, again, to proceed. A deep-rooted *Superstition* is always spreading wide and more wide. When men, thus labouring under this evil, had (in order to give themselves ease) gone so far as to

* Exod. xxxii. 32, 33.

indulge the fancy of a *vicarious Sacrifice*, it was natural for them, to think of enhancing so cheap an *atonement* by the cost and rarity of the *offering*. And oppressed with their malady, they never rested till they had got to that which they conceived to be the most precious of all, A HUMAN SACRIFICE. Nay, to accumulate the merit of the service by bringing it still nearer home, the madness did not cease to rage till it terminated in INFANTICIDE, or in offering up to their grim idols (instead of themselves) the CHILDREN of their bowels. We learn from *Sanchoniathon*, in that inestimable fragment of Antiquity, translated by *Philobiblius*, that what is here collected from the natural course of things, is realized by fact. *It was customary in ancient times* (says the fragment) *in great and public calamities, before things became incurable, for Princes and Magistrates to offer up in sacrifice to the avenging Demons, the dearest of their Offspring.** Under the fanatic fury of the high efficacy of this *atonement*, we need not wonder that the strongest instincts of Nature should be subdued, and even their very impressions effaced, in this horrid sacrifice, when we reflect that mere *civil custom*, to avoid only a probable, nay, but a possible, inconvenience, was, in those early times, of force enough to eraze, even out of the best cultivated minds, the innate *love of Parents for their Children*, and to introduce a general practice of *exposing* them, at their birth, to almost inevitable destruction. What power then must this magic of custom acquire, when joined to dire Superstition, under the horror of approaching vengeance, to dispose the terrified Supplicant to offer up his own kind to avert it; nay, to make all sure, his own offspring, not only with indifference, but with alacrity!

This seems to have been the true original of HUMAN SACRIFICE:† An infernal practice, which soon overspread the World, barbarous and civil. For that LOVE and FEAR of God, implanted in our Nature to improve and perfect HUMANITY, do, when become degenerate by fanatic and servile passions, make as speedy a progress in dishonouring and debasing it.

From this HISTORY of the origin, use, and abuse of SACRIFICE, thus delivered, on the principles of Nature and Reason, and verified by Fact, I have deduced, and, with the fullest evidence, established the following truths.

1. First, That the mode of Religious Worship by SACRIFICE, is, in itself, A REASONABLE SERVICE.

2. Secondly, That Sacrifice for sin was a fit atonement, and reasonably required in the Dispensations both of *natural* and *revealed*

* Apud EUSEBII *Præp. Evang.* lib. iv. p. 158.—Ἔθος ἦν τοῖς παλαιοῖς, ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις συμφοραῖς τῶν κινδύνων, ἀντὶ τῆς πάντων φθορᾶς τὸν ἠγαπημενὸν τῶν τέκνων τοὺς κρατοῦντας ἢ πόλεως ἢ ἔθνους, εἰς σφαγὴν ἐπιδιδόναι λύτρον τοῖς τιμωροῖς δαίμοσι, κατεσφάττοντο δὲ οἱ διδόμενοι μυστικῶς. † See note G, at the end of this book.

Religion, as a proper means of reconciling sinful man to his offended Master.

3. Thirdly, That this species of it, which is most open to objection, the VICARIOUS SACRIFICE, is founded in Reason, when directed to the *Mosaic* and *Christian* Systems; how abusive and absurd soever, when practised in the offices of *Paganism*.

Nothing but *this history of Sacrifice* could lay open the way to these Truths: And nothing but these Truths could let us into the true System of GOSPEL REDEMPTION. For till it was shewn that a VICARIOUS ATONEMENT, a thing of the essence of this System, is consonant to our most rational ideas of the divine attributes; it might be thought, by those who only saw the abuse, and were ignorant of the genuine use of *vicarious atonement*, that our proving the death of Christ to be a REAL SACRIFICE, was only adding one embarrass more in the road of *Revelation*, instead of removing (as was my intention) a great many that ignorance hath laid across it.

But having now obviated the SOCINIAN objection to this species of Sacrifice, we may proceed without further impediment to establish this capital Principle of the Christian Faith, THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST ON THE CROSS FOR THE REDEMPTION OF MANKIND.

1. Which will be done, first of all, by shewing that the *precious death upon the Cross* was, for many ages, *prefigured*, and, in a scenical manner, *foretold* by the SACRIFICES OF THE LAW; and more particularly and circumstantially by those *Sacrifices* called PIACULAR and VICARIOUS.

2. And secondly, by shewing that this DEATH was kept in perpetual memory under the Christian Dispensation, by a SACRED RITE, instituted by the Divine Victim himself, on his going to be offered; this *Rite* being (to speak properly) nothing but, nor other than, A FEAST UPON A SACRIFICE.

I. All Christian Churches, even the *Socinian*, agree in this, that the Sacrifices of the Jewish Law served, amongst other uses, for TYPES of the *death of Christ*, particularly those Sacrifices called *vicarious*, *piacular*, and *expiatory*. Of which, some prefigured one part of that tremendous transaction, and some another.—The victim burnt without the Camp foretold his sufferings without the City—The blood sprinkled in the *Sanctum Sanctorum* by the High-priest, on the day of expiation, prefigured our entrance into heaven, whither Christ prepared the way for us by his blood—The sacrifice of the Paschal-Lamb, which was both *piacular* and *eucharistical*, proclaimed the innocence of our Redeemer, and the universal benefit of his blood to Mankind.

To set this matter in the clearest light—As to the simple rite of SACRIFICE, this was not peculiar to Judaism. It was in use, as we

have shewn, from the beginning. Nature dictated this Symbol to all her Children: It being nothing else than a species of Worship, in *action* instead of *words;* so that *sacrifice* and *religious worship* were correlative and coeval ideas. The particular thing which Moses indulged to his people, for the *hardness of their hearts,* was that *multifarious Ritual,* of which, indeed, Sacrifice makes a capital part.

Amongst the various causes of the *Mosaic Ritual,* the principal were these:

1. First, A necessity of complying with those inveterate prejudices (least liable to idolatrous abuse) which a long abode in Egypt had induced: amongst the chief was their attachment to SACRIFICE; a species of divine worship, which, at this time, made almost the whole of Religion in the Egyptian world. These people (as hath been observed before) reckoning up six hundred and sixty-six sorts of *sacrifice.*

2. A second cause of the Mosaic Ritual was to debar the people from their too ready entrance to Idolatry, by keeping them continually occupied in the performance of their sacred Rites to the GOD OF ISRAEL; whose NAME, when lost in all other places, was, by their SEPARATION, to be preserved in the land of Judea, till *the fulness of time should come.*

3. A third was to PREFIGURE, by these Rites of Sacrifice, the DEATH OF CHRIST UPON THE CROSS: For the *Mosaic Religion* being the foundation of, and preparatory to, the *Christian,* it was fit and proper to connect these two parts of God's moral Dispensation, in such a manner that their mutual relation might, in a proper time, become evident to all men. For in two Religions related to each other, as the MEANS and the END, the FOUNDATION and the SUPERSTRUCTURE, nothing can be more conformable to our ideas of Divine Wisdom, than its contriving some ties which might establish the knowledge, and perpetuate the memory of that close relation, without immaturely explaining the particulars of it. Now what can be conceived more effectual for this purpose than to make the RITES of the *one* Religion TYPICAL, that is, declarative and expressive of the general *nature* of the *other?*

These various uses of SACRIFICE in the Mosaic Ritual cannot but raise our admiration of the divine Wisdom, which hath so contrived, that the very Worship indulged to the Israelites, in compassion to their childish prejudices, should not only prevent the abuses, the natural effect of those prejudices which led to idolatry, but, at the same time, should establish and proclaim, by means of their TYPICAL representations, a strong and lasting connection between the two Religions. *Representations* so apposite to this end and purpose, that

all the sects and parties in Christianity, how widely soever they differ amongst themselves in other matters, agree in this, that *the sacrifices of the Law*, besides the other uses in the Mosaic institution, are TYPICAL OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST.* So far, we say, all the Christian Churches, even the SOCINIAN, agree with us. In this, they differ; they pretend, that though the *Jewish Sacrifices* prefigured the death of Christ, as *Types* of it, yet it does not follow that *his death* was a *real Sacrifice*, like the Jewish. On the contrary, we affirm, that this alone is sufficient to shew, that if the *Type* was a *real Sacrifice*, the Antitype must be so likewise. For (to enter a little more particularly into this mode of representation) a TYPE differs from a SYMBOL in this, that the Type represents something *future*; the *Symbol*, something *past* or *present*.—The commanded Sacrifice of Isaac was given for a *Type*; the Sacrifices of the *Law* were *Types*. The Images of the Cherubims over the Propitiatory were *Symbols*; the bread and wine in the last Supper were *Symbols*.

So far they agree in their *genus*, that they are equally REPRESENTATIONS; but in their *species*, they differ widely.

It is not required that the *Symbol* should partake of the *nature* of the thing represented: The Cherubims shadowed out the celerity of Angels, but not by any physical celerity of their own; the bread and wine shadowed out the body and blood of Christ, but not by any change in the Elements.

But *Types* being, on the contrary, representations of *things future*, and so partaking of the nature of *Prophecy*, were to convey information concerning the *nature* of the *Antitypes*, or of the things represented; which they could not do, but by the exhibition of their own nature.

Hence we collect, that the command to offer Isaac, being the command to offer a *real Sacrifice*, the death and sufferings of Christ, thereby represented, was a *real Sacrifice*. And the piacular and vicarious Sacrifices of the LAW being *real Sacrifices*, the Death on the Cross was a *real Sacrifice* likewise.

Were this otherwise, the *Type*, as a *Type*, would contain more than was contained in the *antitype*. An absurdity, which makes the *Shadow* convey more than the *Substance*; when, by its very nature, it should convey less. On this Truth, the reasoning in the Epistle to the Hebrews is founded.—"Christ" (says the Apostolic Writer) "was once *offered* to bear the sins of many. For the *Law* having the SHADOW of good things to come, and not the VERY IMAGE of the things, can never with those *Sacrifices*, which they offered, year by

* See what hath been said of the logical and natural propriety of *Types* and *secondary senses*, book vi. sect. 6, of "the Divine Legation."

year, continually, make the comers thereunto perfect: for then would they not have ceased to be offered." *

The Jewish Sacrifices are here called SHADOWS, not in an absolute, but in a comparative sense. The *Type* is inferior to the *Antitype*, just as, in visible things, a natural *shadow* is to an artificial *image*. For the *Typical* Sacrifices of the *Law*, having, besides their property of *Types*, a MORAL IMPORT, (and not like the Typical Sacrifice commanded to be offered by Abraham, *a mere shadow, without any moral import,)* are called *Shadows*, not in opposition to realities (for having a *moral import*, they are *realities)*; but called *Shadows*, only in comparison to the vast disparity between the virtues of the *Types* and the *Antitype*, thus explained and enforced by the same inspired Writer—" For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the *purifying of the flesh*, HOW MUCH MORE shall the blood of Christ, who *offered* himself without spot to God, *purge your conscience* from dead works to serve the living God?" †

Again; though, from hence, it appears that these *Types* with the *Antitype* are occupied in the elucidation of the same great subject, yet it will not follow, that every several *Type* is equally expressive of the Antitype. Some of them shall present a more perfect image of the *Antitype* than others; yet they do not exclude the most imperfect from a share in the honour of so august a representation. For though the divine Author of the System had ordained, that the whole of the Jewish Ritual, concerning Sacrifices, should *typify* or prefigure the great SACRIFICE OF CHRIST; yet as those *Sacrifices*, at the same time, constituted an essential part of the Mosaic Œconomy, which, on several occasions, I have expressed more generally by the terms of their bearing a MORAL IMPORT, it could not but be that some would carry *fainter*, and others *stronger shadows*, or *images* of what as *Types* they represented; just as the various Jewish service, in its moral nature, afforded more or less occasions of evidence. Thus, the *Type* of the *Paschal-Lamb* was a more perfect representation, than the *Type* of the *Victim burnt without the Camp*.

It might, and probably would have been otherwise, had these Types borne *no moral import*, like the command to offer Isaac, for then nothing could have hindered all the *Types* from being as complete representations of the *Antitype* as that *command to Abraham* was; and if nothing hindered, it is reasonable to suppose, it would have been done.

We have observed, that these *Types*, in the Mosaic Ritual, were a kind of *Prophecy by action;* in which Providence was pleased to

* Heb. ix. 28; x. 1, 2. See book vi. sect. 6, of "the Divine Legation." † Heb. ix. 13, 14.

manifest to the world, the real connexion between the Jewish and the Christian Revelations. But this was not all. The other sort of Prophecy was not wanting, which, by way of eminence, has commonly assumed the *name*, viz. The written Predictions of the Jewish Prophets. Where, in a detailed account of the PROMISED MESSIAH, the principal part relates to his death and sufferings on the cross, under the idea of a SACRIFICE. And if, as hath been pretended, these things relate to *Jesus* only in a *secondary sense*, and to the Jewish Leaders in a *primary;* this would only make the analogy between these two kinds of Prediction more complete, and the connexion between the two Religions more strong and durable. For the Jewish Sacrifices, though as *types* they refer *ultimately* to Christ, yet as a religious service not typical, they had, like Prophecy, a prior reference to the LAW. So admirable is this coincidence between these two sorts of *prediction*. As to the logical and moral fitness of SECONDARY SENSES, I have explained that matter at large in the former parts of this work.*

Hitherto in support of the Doctrine of the GREAT SACRIFICE ON THE CROSS. And this alone seems abundantly sufficient to establish it.

But this is not the whole. It was not only FORETOLD by the Types and other Prophecies of the *old Law*, but the Remembrance of it was PERPETUATED by a divine Institution in the *new:* and an explanation of this Rite is the last step we shall take to fix this fundamental Article of our holy Faith.

In those Ages of the World,† when Victims made a principal part of the Religion both of Jews and Gentiles, the *Sacrifice* was commonly followed by a religious Feast on the thing offered, called *a Feast upon, or after, the Sacrifice;* the partakers of which were supposed to become partakers of the BENEFITS of the Sacrifice. In allusion to this custom, Jesus was pleased to institute a Feast of the same kind. —In order of time, indeed, the *Feast* naturally *followed* the *Sacrifice*. But in this great Atonement, where the VICTIM, the OFFERER, and the PRIEST, were all one and the same Person, the *Feast* was, of necessity, to *precede* the Sacrifice.

The history of this institution is recorded, by the Evangelists, in these words:—"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat, THIS IS MY BODY: and he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for THIS IS MY BLOOD of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins." ‡

* See book vi. sect. 6. † See "the Discourse on the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper." ‡ Matt. xxvi. 26, &c.

Now, to manifest that we are not mistaken in the idea here given of this Rite, let us reflect on the precise time of its celebration.

As Jesus, with his Disciples, (says the text,) was concluding the Paschal Supper, which was a Jewish *Feast after the Sacrifice*, his own approaching Sacrifice naturally suggested to him the idea of this *customary Feast*. But being himself both the *Victim* and the *Offerer*, the Institution of this Rite must of necessity, as we observed, *precede* the *Sacrifice*—The *Sacrifice on the Cross* was the *Antitype* of the *Paschal-Lamb ;* and the *Feast* on Christ's Sacrifice was the *Antitype* of the Paschal-feast. So that the properest season we can conceive for the institution of the *last supper*, was the instant of time between the celebration of the *type*, and the offering of the *Antitype*. This time likewise corresponded with Christ's usual practice, who was wont to deliver his instructions by actions and expressions, bearing allusion to what passed before his eyes, or presented itself, in the natural course of things, to his observation.* These considerations shew, that the *action*, in the celebration of this Rite, was so strongly declarative of its nature, that had Jesus only broken the bread and given the cup *in remembrance of himself*, without adding, *this is my body* and *this is my blood*, no ingenuous Hearer could entertain a doubt, whether this was designed by him as a *Feast upon the Sacrifice*. But when to this we add the remaining part of the explanatory words, in the consecration of the Elements—THIS IS MY BODY—THIS IS MY BLOOD—what is here contended for becomes almost self-evident.

In these *feasts upon sacrifices*, the very *body* that had been offered was eaten for the repast. Now, as the *last supper* was to be instituted, and the Rite first celebrated, *before* the great Sacrifice was actually offered, (for the reason just now given,) it was on that account (not to mention other reasons) necessary that some *symbolic elements* should be substituted in the place of the *very body and blood*. These elements were BREAD AND WINE: on this occasion naturally, properly, and elegantly called, THE BODY AND BLOOD.

For if the specific nature of the *last supper* was *a feast upon Sacrifice*, we must needs conclude, that the divine Instituter of the feast would give all possible evidence of so important a Truth.

But if (as was in fact the case) this evidence must arise from, and out of, the occasion, and through the *words* of the Institution, then the figurative terms of BODY and BLOOD became necessary, these only being fully declarative of the nature of the Rite. And as this

* See SIR ISAAC NEWTON'S "Observations on the Prophecies," p. 148; where he takes notice how Jesus, from *the approach of harvest*—from *the lilies in bloom*—from *the leaves of the fig-trees shot out*—from *the sheep kept in folds near the temple for sacrifice*—was accustomed to take occasion of inculcating his spiritual Doctrines and Precepts.

made the use of these *terms* to be necessary, so the *necessity* of them produced their ease and elegance. This is observed, because it has been usual amongst Protestants, even while they were opposing the portentous doctrine of TRANSUBSTANTIATION,* to acknowledge, either through ignorance of, or inattention to, the specific nature of the Rite, that the figure of *body and blood* was extremely violent and forced.

It likewise removes another difficulty, which the advocates for a *real presence* throw in the way of common sense. They pretend that, if the words of the institution were only FIGURATIVE, the Evangelist and St. Paul might, and probably would, have changed the *figure*, in their narratives, five times repeated on different occasions; for that no reason can be given of the unvaried use of the same words, but because they are to be understood LITERALLY; and then as they were declarative of one of the greatest Mysteries in Religion, there was a necessity to record the *very terms* employed, whenever the history of the Institution was related. To this, it is sufficient to reply, that, indeed, were the words used *figuratively*, and the *figure* only expressive of a death commemorated, and no more, as the Socinians suppose it to be, it would be but reasonable to think, the terms would have been varied by one or other of the sacred Writers; because it is natural to believe, that Writers of so different genius and acquirements in language would not all have the same opinion concerning the use of these *precise terms*, so as to esteem them preferable to any other; as, in fact, on this idea of the Rite, they would not be. But we can by no means allow their consequence, that, therefore, they are to be understood LITERALLY; since, if we admit the Institution to be of the nature of *a feast upon Sacrifice*, there will be the same necessity for the unvaried use of the terms, although they be *figurative*, as there would have been although they were *literal*. For these precise terms are as necessary to denote *a feast upon Sacrifice* (the Rite we contend for) as to denote the Sacrifice itself; the enormous idea of the church of Rome.

All this reasoning on the nature of the Institution, from the words of the Institutor, receives additional strength even from what hath been supposed to invalidate it, namely, the conclusion of them—DO THIS IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME—For although these words, when delivered alone, might enjoin no more than a *remembrance of a dead benefactor*, (which is the sense the Socinians put upon them) yet, when preceded by—THIS IS MY BODY—THIS IS MY BLOOD—they are certainly an injunction to keep in *remembrance* his death and passion for our REDEMPTION. And could there be a feast upon a Sacrifice in which that *Sacrifice* was not to be kept in mind?

* See note H, at the end of this book.

It is true, that the Disciples of Christ being commanded to do this *in remembrance of him*, the Command shews that the celebration of this *Feast* was continually to be *repeated*, which was not the practice in the Pagan and Jewish *feasts after the sacrifice*. But, in this particular, the reason of the difference is apparent—The GREAT SACRIFICE itself (of which the Jewish were *Types)* put an end to that mode of Religious Worship amongst the Followers of Jesus.

Jewish and Pagan oblations had, or were supposed to have, a passing and temporary Virtue. *For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the Comers thereunto perfect :* FOR THEN WOULD THEY NOT HAVE CEASED TO BE OFFERED.*

But the Sacrifice on the CROSS is the very *image* or the thing itself; and therefore has more than *a passing and temporary effect*, it continues operating till the consummation of all things; because *it makes the comers thereunto perfect :* we being sanctified through the *offering of the body and blood of Christ*, ONCE FOR ALL :† *for where remission of sins is, there is* NO MORE OFFERING FOR SIN.‡ It seemed expedient, therefore, that the operating virtue of this Sacrifice, *offered once for all*, should be continually set before our minds, in repeated celebrations of the *Feast upon it*.

What hath been here reasoned, on the *Institution of the last supper*, appeared so strong to a late eminent Person, famous for his Socinian notions on this Subject, that (as I have been told) he used to confess, that if the death of Christ could be proved to be a *real Sacrifice*, the *last Supper* was undoubtedly of the nature of the *Feast after the Sacrifice*. This was said with his usual address, to make his Reader overlook, and so to neglect, one of the capital arguments for a *real sacrifice;* for it insinuates, that arguments for its *reality* are to be sought for elsewhere, and not in the institution of this *Rite :* Whereas it is our design to shew, that this very Rite of the *last supper* constitutes one of the capital arguments for the reality of the Sacrifice itself. And, therefore, let us now go on with it.

We have seen what may be naturally, and, indeed, what must be necessarily, concluded from this part of the Evangelic History of the Institution of the LAST SUPPER, concerning Christ's design therein.

Let us see next what may be collected of St. Paul's sense concerning the same; who, although occasionally, yet hath at large spoken of the nature of the LAST SUPPER.

And here we shall find, that from this very *sort of Feast* (which the *words* of the Institution of it plainly alluded to) St. Paul expressly draws a comparison; and, at the same time, to explain the *efficacy* of

* Heb. x. 1, 2. † Verse 10. ‡ Verse 18.

the *Rite*, informs us of the end and purpose of those *Feasts upon Sacrifice*.

It is in that place of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, where he reproves the proselytes to Christianity for the idolatrous practice of sitting with the Gentiles, in their *feasts upon Sacrifice*, and eating of the meats that had been offered to Idols.

His words are these—"I speak as to *wise men*: judge ye what I say. The *Cup of Blessing*, which we bless, is it not the COMMUNION OF THE BLOOD OF CHRIST? The *bread, which we break*, is it not the COMMUNION OF THE BODY OF CHRIST? For we, being many, are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread. Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the Sacrifices, Partakers of the Altar? What say I, then? *That an idol is any thing, or that that which is offered to idols is any thing?* But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils, and not to God: and I would not that you should have FELLOWSHIP with Devils. Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils: ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of Devils."*

The Apostle here professeth to write to these Corinthians, under their own assumed character of *wise men*. And, though, perhaps, he useth the term a little ironically—*as wise in their own conceit*,—to reprove the *divisions*, before objected to them, yet the logical inference, drawn from an appeal to men of such a character, is not at all weakened by the sarcasm under which it is conveyed. My meaning is, we may fairly conclude, that St. Paul's reasoning is such as, in his opinion, *wise men* would not disdain to weigh; and so regularly conducted, that *wise men* would acknowledge to be of force. In a word, pursued with that science and exactness, which leaves no room for the pretence of its having a loose, popular, or inaccurate meaning.

Whence we may collect, in the first place, that the *Cup of blessing* is not *merely a general commemoration of a dead Benefactor*, but principally *a commemoration of the* DEATH AND PASSION *of that Benefactor*. It is the *Communion of the blood of Christ*; an expression, as we have shewn, of the utmost elegance to denote *a feast upon Sacrifice*.

The inference which the Apostle draws from it, puts his meaning out of question.—*For we, being many* (says he) *are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread*: i. e. Our being *partakers of one bread*, in the communion, makes us, of MANY (which we are by nature), to become (by grace) ONE BODY in Christ. This inference is manifestly just, if the *Rite* be of the nature of *a Feast upon Sacrifice*; for then *the Communion of the body and blood of*

* 1 Cor. x. 15—21.

Christ unites the *Receivers* into one body, by an equal distribution of one common benefit. But if it be *merely the Commemoration of a dead benefactor*, it leaves the *Receivers* as it found them; *not one body, incorporated by a common benefit*, but many separate individuals, professing one common Faith.

The Apostle having thus represented the LAST SUPPER to be of the nature of *a Feast upon Sacrifice*, for the truth of which he appeals to their own conceptions of it—*the cup of blessing, is it not the Communion? &c.—the bread which we break, is it not the Communion? &c.*

He then endeavours to convince them of the *impiety* of their behaviour, from the nature of *those feasts*, as it was understood both by Jews and Gentiles; who alike held, that they WHO EAT OF THE SACRIFICES WERE PARTAKERS OF THE ALTAR: *i. e.* had the benefits of the Sacrifice. But what had these *eaters of the things sacrificed*, in common with the Partakers of the bread and wine in the LAST SUPPER, if this *Supper* was not a *feast* of the same kind with the *sacrificial Feasts?* If the three religious Feasts, Pagan, Jewish, and Christian, had not one common nature,* How could the Apostle have inferred that this intercommunity was absolutely inconsistent?—*Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of Devils.* For though there might be *impiety* in the promiscuous use of Pagan and Christian Rites; yet the *inconsistency* arises from their having one common nature, which, springing from contrary originals, destroys one another's effects. The reasoning stands thus—*Those who eat of the Sacrifice are partakers of the Altar;* that is, are partakers of the benefits of the Sacrifice. These Benefits, whether real or imaginary, were confirmed by a pact or convention between the Sacrificer and his God. They who eat in *the feast on that Sacrifice* are partakers of the supposed benefits of the Sacrifice, and, consequently, are Parties to the federal Rites which confirmed those benefits: so that the same Man could not, consistently with himself, be Partaker of both *tables*, the Lord's table and that of *Devils*.

This argument, St. Paul urges to the *Wise Men*, whose practice he is here exposing. And we see, it turns altogether on the Postulatum agreed on, "that the *Last Supper* is of the nature of a feast upon Sacrifice."

Now, if, instead of this idea, we substitute that other of the *Socinians, That the Last Supper is a mere commemoration of a dead Benefactor*, all the force of this reasoning disappears and vanishes. For, although a reasonable man cannot execute two federal conventions, which destroy one another (the inconsistency here charged upon the Corinthians), yet he might celebrate, without *absurdity*, though

* See note I, at the end of this book.

not without *impiety*, a federal Rite in one religion, and a bare remembrance of a deceased Benefactor in another.

Further, the same Apostle, in correcting another abuse in the celebration of the *Lord's Supper*, takes occasion, once again, to declare the NATURE of this holy Rite.—His Corinthians, as appears by the next Chapter,* had been guilty of eating the *bread* and *wine* in a very indecent manner, confounding it with the convivial doings in their ordinary repasts; where charity and sobriety had been too often violated. This faulty behaviour, by such an indiscriminate celebration, the Apostle calls the being *guilty of the body and blood of Christ:* a charge immoderately exaggerated, were the Last Supper *a mere commemoration of a dead Benefactor*. The Corinthians did not make a fit distinction between their more ordinary food, and their eating and drinking *in memory of a deceased Friend*. This, without doubt, was a high indecorum; yet, to rank such delinquents with the *Murderers of the Lord of life*, is a severity in which we can see neither justice in the sentence, nor propriety in the terms of it. But let us only suppose (what we have indeed proved), that St. Paul regarded the Last Supper as *a feast upon Sacrifice*, that is, a Rite in which the benefits of Christ's death and passion were, in a certain manner, conveyed, in a proper celebration, thus impiously abused; and then the charge is fairly and justly made out. The profanation of such a Rite was, indeed, aiding and assisting in the crime of his Murderers, as far forth as it rendered his death ineffectual to the Participants; and therefore properly compared to the prodigious enormity of that impious act.

Such then, I presume, is the true nature of the LORD'S SUPPER. And were the adjusting an exact notion of it a matter of mere speculation, I should have been much shorter; and have left the discussion of it (under the simple idea of a religious custom of Christian Antiquity) to the Ecclesiastical Historian.

But the Institution abounds with important consequences, in support of the Catholic Doctrine, which I here pretend to illustrate and confirm. For, if *the Last Supper be a feast upon Sacrifice*, the unavoidable consequence is, that *the death of Christ was a real Sacrifice*. It being the highest absurdity to believe, that a Rite was instituted on the supposition of *a real Sacrifice*, and to keep such Sacrifice in perpetual memory, and yet that *no real Sacrifice*, thus commemorated, ever had existence; but only the *shadow* of one, under a figure of Speech.

And now it is high time to call again upon the SOCINIANS to examine and review this whole matter.

The Writers of the New Testament unanimously and invariably

* 1 Cor. xi. 27.

call the Death of Christ on the Cross, A SACRIFICE. To this, the SOCINIANS reply, "We confess, indeed, that those Writers do thus uniformly qualify the Death of Christ. But their Phraseology abounds with FIGURATIVE TERMS; and the word SACRIFICE is plainly and eminently of this number.—When the death of Christ, so highly beneficial to mankind, was the subject of their discourse, they could not enforce the value of those Benefits so intelligibly and strongly amongst Men, who had been taught to conceive that the highest benefits were conveyed by the tremendous Rite of SACRIFICE. But that this was all which those Writers meant, when they called Christ's death a SACRIFICE, appears from hence, that SACRIFICE, whatever original it had, soon became, in practice, a superstitious and an irrational Rite; and gloried in an efficacy which right reason disavows, namely a VICARIOUS ATONEMENT; brought, indeed, by Moses, together with other pagan Rites, into the LAW, on account of the hardness of heart amongst those with whom their Leader had to deal." This, and a great deal more to the same purpose, hath had its effect, to the discredit of the doctrine of REDEMPTION, on those Men, and on others, as ignorant of the true origin and nature of SACRIFICE as themselves.

To remove these objections to a Doctrine so essential to our faith, is the reason why I have been so large in proving,

1. First, From the origin and nature of SACRIFICE, that it is A REASONABLE SERVICE.

2. Secondly, That a VICARIOUS ATONEMENT, how much soever disclaimed by *natural Religion*, is, in the *Jewish Sacrifices* and in the *Sacrifice of Christ*, a proper *atonement;* and may be justified on the surest principles of reason.

3. Thirdly, That the Sacrifices of the *Law* were TYPICAL of the great Sacrifice of *Christ*.

4. Fourthly, That, were it the purpose of the sacred Writers, in their history of Christ's death and passion, to represent it as a REAL SACRIFICE, it is not possible to conceive they could convey that meaning in more expressive terms than in those which they have employed.

5. And lastly, That Christ's death and passion was, by himself, ordained to be perpetually commemorated; by a Rite which declares *that* Death could be no other than a *real Sacrifice*.

When the SOCINIANS, I say, have well considered all this, they may be asked with propriety, and modesty, whether it can be believed by any reasonable man, that all this apparatus was provided for, and bestowed upon, a MERE FIGURE OF SPEECH? Or whether they deserve the title they give themselves, of being the only rational interpreters of Scripture, who can suppose such a perversion of Order,

in the divine œconomy, as that it should dignify a MERE FIGURE OF SPEECH with preceding TYPES, and a following FESTIVE INSTITUTION; things, most improper for this Service; and only fitted to mislead us in our notions and conceptions concerning this capital doctrine of our holy *Religion?*

We have now (it is presumed) settled the true SPECIFIC NATURE of the death of Christ; and having before spoken largely of its END, we proceed to consider the effects of it.

They are comprised by the sacred Writers in the words, REDEMPTION and JUSTIFICATION.

Redemption respects the price paid by JESUS for our restoration to eternal life; and *Justification*, the acceptance of that price by GOD THE FATHER.

From these two terms School Divines coined a third, namely, SATISFACTION; which carries in it the ideas of a debt *paid*, and *accepted*.

The disputes amongst Divines concerning the sense and propriety of the terms, *Redemption* and *Atonement*, *Justification*, *Satisfaction*, *&c.* have been endless, and the confusion attending them inexplicable; chiefly occasioned by all parties mistaking their ground, and arguing on the principles of NATURAL LAW, when they should have had recourse to the REVEALED, as now explained.

But here a difficulty occurs. LIFE AND IMMORTALITY is, throughout the New Testament, considered as a FREE GIFT; called so in express words by St. Paul—"but not as the *offence*," (says he) "so also is the FREE GIFT."* Yet, we know, a large price was paid for it. And this, likewise, the same Apostle agrees to,—"We were BOUGHT" (says he) "with a price."† And St. Peter, speaking of certain heretics, says, *They denied the Lord that* BOUGHT *them.*‡ And St. Paul again calls, what he had just before entitled A FREE GIFT,—A PURCHASED POSSESSION.§

To clear up this matter, and to reconcile the Apostle to himself, who certainly was neither defective in natural sense, nor in artificial logic, let us once again remind the reader, that *Life and Immortality*, bestowed on Adam in Paradise, was a FREE GIFT, as appears from the history of his Creation. As a *free gift*, it was taken back by the Donor, when Adam fell; to which resumption, our original natural rights are not subject; since natural Religion teacheth, that sincere repentance alone will reinstate us in the possession of those rights, which our crimes had suspended. So that when this free gift, forfeited by the *first* Adam, was recovered by the *second*, its nature continuing the same, it must still remain a *free gift;* a gift to which man, by and at his creation, had no claim; a gift which natural religion did not bestow.

* Rom. v. 15. † 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23. ‡ 2 Peter ii. 1. § Eph. i. 14.

But, if misled by measuring this *revealed mystery* of human redemption, by the scant idea of human transactions, where a *free gift* and a *purchased benefit* are commonly opposed to one another, yet even here we may be able to set ourselves right; since, with regard to man, the character of a *free gift* remains to *immortality restored*. For the price paid for forfeited man, was not paid by him, but by a Redeemer of Divine extraction, who was pleased, by participating of man's nature, to stand in his stead. Hence the sacred Writers seeing, in this case, the perfect agreement between a FREE GIFT and a PURCHASED POSSESSION, sometimes call it by the one, and sometimes by the other name.

CHAPTER III.

So much for the MEANS of recovering what was lost by *Adam's* transgression.

In the entrance on this subject, I cautioned the Reader to keep in mind the distinction between the MEANS of recovering a lost benefit, and the CONDITION annexed to the enjoyment of that benefit, when recovered, as two different things, to be separately considered, and in their order.

With regard to the MEANS, (already explained at large,) it hath been shewn, that they were of an *arbitrary* nature, at God's good pleasure to appoint; unrestrained by any thing he had established in the general system of his moral government of man.

These MEANS, had not our holy Religion revealed them, could not, otherwise, have been known.

They were the DEATH AND SACRIFICE of his ever blessed Son, *Mediating* for us.

And now, *Man* being restored to his forfeited Inheritance, the secure possession of it still depended, as it did in the original grant, on the performance of a CONDITION.

We have already shewn, Why that *first Condition* was the observance of a POSITIVE COMMAND. Which reasoning if it have any force, proves, that the *new condition*, annexed to the recovered blessing, must be the observance of a POSITIVE COMMAND likewise.

IMMORTALITY (as hath been shewn) was a FREE GIFT, as well when *recovered*, as when *originally given*; which might be bestowed, or recovered when forfeited, on what *Condition* the Divine Donor should be pleased to annex to it.

Nay, if we consider the nature of the whole œconomy, we shall find it could not well be given, or restored when lost, on any other condition than the observance of a *positive Command*, since the performance of MORAL DUTY was the *condition* already appropriated, by *Natural Religion*, to the procurement of GOD'S FAVOUR.

It is true, had IMMORTALITY not been a *free gift*, but what Man

had a right to, on his Creation, while under the government of *Natural Religion*, the condition annexed to immortality might have been the performance of *Moral Duty*.

And indeed, those who so far mistake *immortality* as to esteem it a RIGHT, inherent in our nature, contend strongly for the *condition's* being of a *moral kind;* and that the command—*not to eat of the Tree of good and evil*, enjoined to Man in Paradise, is *so* to be understood, though delivered under the cover of an Allegory.

But besides the reason given to evince this mistake, another arises from the sacred Writer's not *explaining* this pretended Allegory: for where an *Allegory* contains a precept respecting the whole of *moral duty*, it can never be too plainly nor fully delivered. There would be none of this necessity if both the first and second condition of *immortal Life* were of a *positive nature*, though delivered in allegoric terms which spoke for themselves; for then the chief use of an interpretation had been little more than the gratification of our curiosity.

Allow, therefore, the reasoning here offered to explain the nature of the *condition* annexed to the *free gift* (when first given, and when, after forfeiture, restored) to be solid and convincing, and it opens to us the abundant goodness of our Maker; who, that the possession of this recovered blessing might be no longer precarious, (as it was when first bestowed, on the condition *to Do or to forbear Doing*) was graciously pleased to change one positive Command for another; and, instead of something *to be Done*, hath now required of us something TO BE BELIEVED. From henceforth the *free gift* of immortality is become more permanent and certain: a GRACE, which the very nature of the *new Dispensation* would lead us to hope for and expect; whereby IMMORTAL LIFE under the Gospel, like the FAVOUR OF THE DEITY under *natural Religion*, is now, when forfeited, to be regained by REPENTANCE.

So much reason, order, and beauty is seen in the various parts of God's moral Government of Man, when compared and explained by one another.

The new CONDITION, as we say, is FAITH IN THE REDEEMER; or our owning and receiving him as the promised Messiah, by whom alone we are to receive that salvation, procured for us by the Sacrifice of himself on the Cross.

And now, we begin to have some reasonable Notion of that great and fundamental principle of Christianity, that FAITH ALONE JUSTIFIETH, or, in other words, is the *sole condition* of recovering the possession of what we lost by ADAM.

This great Truth, though made the foundation of the Gospel of Jesus, yet (its reason lying hid, or not carefully sought for, and the little of it that was seen being horribly abused) *Believers*, as well as

Unbelievers, have, too generally, concurred in condemning, as absurd in speculation, and fanatical and hurtful in practice. But the *Divine* who hath carefully studied the nature of God's moral or religious Dispensations, throughout all their parts, will be easily disposed to rest the whole of the Christian cause on the *reasonableness*, the *propriety*, and even the *necessity* of this Capital Principle.

We have now shewn, 1st, That LIFE AND IMMORTALITY is, in its nature, a FREE GIFT; and that holy Scripture always represents it under this idea: 2ndly, That the benefit, which *Natural Religion* informs us we have to expect from our great Master is, simply, a reward for well-doing: A reward, indeed, which will be abundant; for, though we be *unprofitable servants*, yet is he a most bountiful Master. But ABUNDANT and ETERNAL belong to different Systems.

Man, from his Creation, to his entrance into Paradise, was, as hath been shewn, subject to the *Law of Natural Religion* only. From thenceforth, to his expulsion from Paradise, *Revealed Religion* superinduced to the *Natural*, was to be his Guide: whereby, to GOD'S FAVOUR (the sanction of *Natural Religion)* was added IMMORTALITY (the sanction of the *Revealed;)* not on condition of his observance of *moral duties;* for that was the condition of God's *favour* under Natural Religion; but on condition of his obedience to a *positive command*.

But who are they, who, on the *recovery* of the free gift of immortality, are qualified to claim it? Certainly none but those who are already entitled to *some reward* by the *Religion of Nature;* which Religion accompanies the *Revealed* throughout all its various Dispensations; and on which, they are all founded.

But to make this great principle of JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ALONE still more clear, let us suppose that, at the publication of the Gospel, all to whom the glad tidings of immortality were offered, on the condition of *faith in Jesus*, had been moral or virtuous men; and, on that account, *entitled* (as natural Religion teacheth) to the *favour* of God, and an abundant reward; is it not self-evident, that FAITH ALONE, exclusive of the condition of good works, would, in that case, have been the very thing which *justified*, or entitled to life everlasting?

But are *good works*, therefore, of no use in the Christian system? So far from that impiety, *good works* are seen, by this explanation, to be of the greatest avail; as they render Men the only capable Subjects of this JUSTIFICATION which FAITH ALONE procures.

This is the true use and value of WORKS with regard to FAITH; and greater cannot be conceived. Hence it appears, that JUSTIFYING FAITH is so far from excluding GOOD WORKS, that it necessarily requires them. But how? Not as sharing in that JUSTIFICATION; but as procuring for us a title to God's *favour* in general, they become

the *qualification* of that inestimable Reward, revealed by the Gospel, to be obtained by FAITH ALONE.

To illustrate this matter by a familiar instance: Suppose a British Monarch should bestow, in *free gift*, a certain portion of his own *Domains** upon such of his subjects who should perform a certain service, to which they were not obliged by the stated Laws of that society under which they lived; it is evident, that the performance of this *last engagement* ONLY would be the thing which entitled them to the *free gift:* although that which gave them a claim to protection, as Subjects, in the enjoyment of THEIR OWN PROPERTY,† acquired by observing the terms of the contract between Subjects and Sovereign, was the necessary qualification to their claim of the *free gift;* since it would be absurd to suppose that this gift was intended for Rebels and Traitors, or for any but good and faithful servants of the King and Community.

This, I presume, is the true, as it certainly is the only consistent explanation, which hath been hitherto given of JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ALONE. Well, therefore, might St. Paul reprove the ignorance or licence of certain of his converts at Rome, in his question (which, under his authority, we have asked before) *Do we then make void the* LAW *through* FAITH? *God forbid! Yea, we* ESTABLISH THE LAW.‡

"But how" (it may be asked) "is the *Law of Works* ESTABLISHED by the Christian Doctrine of *Faith?* For by the *Law of Works*, the Apostle could mean no other than the *Law of Nature;* he having again and again told us, the *Law of Moses*, as distinguished from the *Law of Nature*, was abolished by the Law of Christ." I answer, This *Law of Works*, was indeed ESTABLISHED, and in the most substantial manner, by the doctrine of *Faith*, as these *Works* are the very foundation of *justifying Faith;* the qualification of all who are entitled to the *Fruits* of that *Faith*, viz. LIFE AND IMMORTALITY.

But further, to prevent all mistakes on this important subject, (if the wisest provisions of Heaven could have prevented the effects of human perversity, without violating freedom of will) God was pleased to send JOHN THE BAPTIST, as the Fore-runner of his blessed Son, to proclaim and RE-PUBLISH this great principle of *Natural Religion*, PARDON ON REPENTANCE—*Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.*§ A necessary CALL to procure Subjects to this new Kingdom, just ready to be erected, where LIFE AND IMMORTALITY was to be obtained by *Faith;* but *such* a Faith as is founded on those *Works* which *Natural Religion* requires to be performed; or, when neglected, the omission or transgression to be atoned for by REPENTANCE.

This shews the extreme folly of what hath been asserted by certain

* To which *immortality* may be well compared. † To which the reward offered by *natural religion* may be well compared. ‡ Rom. iii. 31. § Matt. iii. 2.

of our unwary Friends, and echoed back to us by the Enemies of our holy faith, that the GOSPEL ITSELF is only A RE-PUBLICATION OF THE RELIGION OF NATURE; whereas, it now appears, that the whole of THIS RE-PUBLICATION amounts to no more than a *re-publication* of one great principle of Natural Religion, viz. *Pardon on Repentance;* and this, as the foundation of (and in order to introduce and render effectual) our FAITH IN CHRIST, the great principle of the *Revealed.*

To proceed. It is with regard to *John's* Character of a Preacher of *Moral Righteousness*, on the principles of Natural Religion, that *Jesus* says of him,—*Amongst them that are born of women hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he:* * *this least in the kingdom of heaven. is greater* (he says) *than John*, i. e. *greater in office.* JOHN only proclaimed and re-published that great Principle of Natural Religion,—*the doing* WORKS *meet for Repentance.*† Whereas the Disciples of Jesus were the Promulgators of the efficacy of Revealed Religion—SAVING FAITH—*Greater* in their spiritual gifts and graces. They worked *Miracles.* John worked *no Miracle.* The reason is obvious: MIRACLES are the necessary CREDENTIALS of men sent by God to promulge a *new Revelation.* The preaching up of *Natural Religion* (which was John's office) needed none of these *Credentials:* its truth having been engraved in the breasts of every one, when God created *Man in his own Image.*

But this is not all. The better to secure this natural Foundation of SAVING FAITH, *Jesus* himself, in his entrance on his Ministry, thought fit to repeat and confirm the Mission of *John;* and in the very words of his Forerunner—REPENT, *for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.*‡ On this account, I suppose, it was that *Herod*, hearing that a new Prophet was just arisen, who began his Ministry like *John*, with preaching *repentance*, because *the kingdom of heaven was at hand*, mistook him for *John risen from the dead;* and being alarmed at the name of *Kingdom*, joined to the report of *Miracles*, now first performed by him, concluded, he was returned to life, with the accession of new powers; Herod, I say, in his fright, cries out,—*John the Baptist, whom I beheaded, is risen from the dead, and* THEREFORE *mighty works do shew forth themselves in him.*§ A natural sentiment on this occasion. For cruelty, in its suspicions, commonly adds terror to superstition.

Yea, further, when *Jesus* first sent out his Disciples to give notice of his Gospel, they, too, were directed to enforce this previous and necessary Truth:—*And they went and preached that men should repent.*‖

* Matt. xi. 11. † Acts xxvi. 20. ‡ Matt. iv. 17. § Matt. xiv. 2. ‖ Mark vi 12.

And they whom he left behind him at his ascension were likewise directed to perform the same office. They began their work with the doctrine of REPENTANCE, only changing the Baptism of *John* into that of *Jesus*. St. Peter, in his first discourse to all the *dwellers at Jerusalem*, who enquired of him into the *way of salvation*, speaks in this manner: *Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ.**

St. Paul tells Agrippa, that he began his Mission with exhorting both Jews and Gentiles, *that they should repent, and turn to God, and do* WORKS *meet for repentance.*† And as he *began* with *repentance*, so he *ends* with it, where, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, he expresseth himself in this manner, "Therefore leaving the PRINCIPLES of the Doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto PERFECTION; not laying again the FOUNDATION of repentance from dead works, and of faith towards God."—These are the great principles of *Natural Religion*, which Christ made the FOUNDATION of his Gospel. Iniquity is called *dead works*—as by *Faith towards God* is meant simple belief in him; and alludes to the same Apostle's definition of Natural Religion —where he says, *he that cometh to God must* BELIEVE *that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.* The sense of which is this,—"Sink not back again to, nor rest in that Principle of *Natural Religion*, after you have made it (as your Master requires you should) the *foundation* of his Gospel."

But as there are not only *first principles* in Natural Religion, but likewise in the Revealed, the Apostle goes on with an account of these likewise—*The doctrines of Baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.* Now these *first principles* of the GOSPEL we are likewise forbid to rest in, no less than in those *first principles* of NATURAL RELIGION, which the Apostle began with—it follows (as we are directed) that we should GO ON UNTO PERFECTION. But if it be asked, *What was this doctrine of perfection?* I answer, it was that great MYSTERY, first revealed by the *Gospel*, which explains our loss by the disobedience of Adam, and the punishment attending it, together with the recovery of that loss by Christ Jesus, who was graciously pleased to become our MEDIATOR; and more than that, by virtue of his death and sufferings on the cross, our REDEEMER likewise, together with all the circumstances attending this wonderful transaction of human redemption.

This *Doctrine of Perfection*, the Apostle promises to explain to them, if God affords him leisure and a fitting opportunity—*if God* (says he) *permit.*‡ This, for some wise ends of his Providence, God did not *permit*. Nor have we any reason to complain, as he endowed his inspired servants, in general, both with leisure and abilities to

* Acts ii. 38. † Acts xxvi. ‡ Heb. vi. 1—3.

enrich the world with the noblest treasures of divine knowledge, ordained to enlighten and accompany his Church till the consummation of all things.

Thus, on the whole, it appears, even by the *principle* here explained, of SALVATION BY FAITH ALONE, that NATURAL RELIGION IS THE GROUND AND FOUNDATION OF ALL THE REVEALED.

Here let us stop a moment, to deplore the condition of human blindness, always running into opposite extremes.—While one sort of Believers (as we have observed) can see no more in the *Gospel* than a *Re-publication of the Religion of Nature;* and another are so far from owning, that *Natural Religion* is the foundation of the Revealed, that they are ready to deny that Natural Religion.

These, indeed, are portentous opinions; yet less so than that of our RATIONALISTS, who deny what Scripture has, in so many words, so often repeated, SALVATION, or JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ALONE.

But they had mistaken the Gospel-doctrine of *salvation* and *justification* for no more than God's *favour* indefinitely, as taught by *Natural Religion;* whereas the words signify ETERNAL LIFE, brought to light and defined by the *Gospel*. What occasioned their confounding two things so different was, an unsuspected error, full as gross, namely, that *Natural Religion*, in teaching a reward for well-doing, taught an *eternal Reward*. An error into which these men could scarce have fallen, had they distinguished the *Religion of Nature*, to which Adam became subject on his creation, from that Religion which was revealed unto him when he entered Paradise.

This hath been rectified at large towards the beginning of this Discourse; and to what important purposes, the Reader may now understand.

Indeed, had *Natural Religion* promised *life and immortality* for *well-doing*, then would God's two Dispensations have contradicted one another; as giving *immortality* to WORKS by *Natural Religion*, and *immortality* to FAITH by the *Revealed*.

But there are no contradictions in the Œconomy of God's moral Government. All such are the spawn of *human Systems*, the mis-shapen issue of *artificial Theology*. And if one thing, in sacred Scripture, seems to look thus asquint upon another, we may be assured it arises from the vitiated Organs of the Observer.

To instance, in the famous case (so apposite to our present purpose) of the Apostles, PAUL and JAMES; whom ignorant Interpreters have set at variance.

St. PAUL says,*—THEREFORE WE CONCLUDE, *that a man* IS JUSTIFIED BY FAITH WITHOUT THE DEEDS OF THE LAW.

* Rom. iii. 28.

But St. James seems to speak another language*—YOU SEE THEN, *how that by* WORKS a man is JUSTIFIED, AND NOT BY FAITH ONLY.

The assertion of each Apostle is (we see) a CONCLUSION from some preceding PREMISES. These are, first of all, to be considered, ere we can determine concerning the sense of either *conclusion*, where the same *capital word* is employed, by both Writers, in common.

St. Paul having explained (for that is his subject) the nature of the GOSPEL COVENANT, whereby we are restored to the Inheritance which we lost by *Adam's* transgression, namely, *life and immortality*, ends his argument in this manner—*Therefore we conclude, that a man is* JUSTIFIED BY FAITH [*i. e.* entitled to this recovered benefit by virtue of *Faith*] WITHOUT THE DEEDS OF THE LAW, [which are *Works.*] We have shewn how true this position is; WORKS being what *justifies* or entitles us to the *favour of God*, as taught by Natural Religion; the foundation, indeed, of the Gospel-Covenant; which promiseth life and immortality to FAITH ALONE.

But St. James, where he seems to talk so differently from Paul, was enforcing a very different thing, namely, the obligation OF MORAL DUTY, as taught by *Natural Religion*, though not exclusive of the *Revealed;* for he exemplifies it by the precepts of the DECALOGUE; which, though a moral part of the LAW, is supported equally on the two Religions, Natural and Revealed. He, therefore, concludes his argument in this manner—*Thus we see, how that by* WORKS A MAN IS JUSTIFIED, *and not by Faith only.*

Hence it appears, that the two Apostles use the word JUSTIFICATION, in these places, in very different senses. St. Paul means by it, a title to *eternal life*, on the terms of *Revealed Religion;* and St. James, a title to *God's favour* indefinitely, on the terms of *Natural Religion.*

Neither can they be fairly charged with obscurity in using an undefined term in different significations, since, had their Readers but attended to the different subjects each apostle was then treating, and both in an equally clear and obvious manner, the objectors would have seen, there was not the least need of a formal definition to ascertain the meaning of either.

On the whole, it appears, that the two Apostles are perfectly consistent in their reasoning on this question. Whose words, when aptly put together, produce this complete and capital Truth,—"WORKS entitle us to a *reward* indefinitely; FAITH to the reward of *eternal life:* But as he who deserves *no reward* at all, can never deserve the reward of *eternal life*, therefore the first step to the *greater* blessing must needs be a title to the *lesser.*"

ST. PAUL'S purpose was to vindicate the use and honour of the *Gospel* from *judaising Christians*, by shewing, that the MORAL WORKS

* His General Epistle, ii. 24.

of the *Jewish Law* (the same with those of *Natural Law)* did not entitle the observers to *eternal life;* this being the specific reward which the *Gospel* bestows, and bestows it on FAITH alone.

St. JAMES's purpose was to vindicate the use and honour of *Natural Religion,* from the corrupt comments of those pretended Christians, who flattered themselves in their vices with the hopes of obtaining *eternal life* by FAITH, without being previously qualified for the FAVOUR of God, by the performance of those *good works* which Natural Religion enjoins: and so vitiating the integrity, and destroying the very nature of FAITH itself. A dreadful Venom, which appeared early, and, like a leprosy, soon overspread the face of the Church; at present known by the detested name of ANTINOMIANISM.

But to leave nothing unanswered on so important a question, I will suppose an Objector may persist in his reply.—Be it granted that the two Apostles are thus made consistent with one another; a stronger objection still remains to the doctrine *of Salvation by* FAITH ALONE, and that is the Declaration of Christ himself, who gives this *Salvation or Justification* to WORKS; where, in his account of his *second coming* to judge the world, he thus pronounces on the final doom of the Nations assembled round his Throne.—To the RIGHTEOUS, he says,—*Come, ye blessed of my Father,* INHERIT THE KINGDOM PREPARED FOR YOU FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD. *For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; I was naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the* RIGHTEOUS *answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? naked, and clothed thee? or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the* KING *shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, forasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my Brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels. For I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying,* LORD, *when saw we thee an hungred, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not unto me.**

* Matt. xxv. 34—45.

Te explain this, which seems to bear so hard against us, we must first of all observe the great care and caution in the divine Founder of our Faith, and of his Apostles, to whom he committed the trust of proclaiming it to the World; the care, I say, that this capital Doctrine of his Religion, JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ALONE, should not be mistaken or abused, in making FAITH supersede those WORKS which Natural Religion requires as necessary to procure the *favour of God.* WORKS, which we have shewn to be the only true foundation of that FAITH WHICH ALONE JUSTIFIES. And the world hath had full experience of the horrid ABUSES occasioned by Men's placing FAITH on any other foundation.

So that were there *no more* in this *Scenical Representation* of the *last Judgment* than the purpose to make good WORKS bear so considerable a part in it, the Representation had been still highly expedient. But there was *a great deal more.*—

—Hold, says an Objector; Let us first ask how this Scene can at all stand with your System, which teacheth, "that WORKS only entitle to a *reward indefinitely;* and that it is FAITH which entitles to the reward of eternal life: for these RIGHTEOUS, in the text, are rewarded with that which is only due to the FAITHFUL, namely, *eternal life.*"

—I was about to explain another important use of this *Representation,* which you will now find is a full answer to your Objection.

—Jesus, in the very *mode* of obviating the above-mentioned *abuses* (for they were those abuses which it was his purpose here to obviate,) hath, with the most divine energy and address, instructed us in another important Truth, namely, THAT THE VIRTUE AND MERITS OF HIS DEATH HAD A RETROSPECT QUITE BACKWARD, EVEN TO THE TIME OF THE FALL. The *Righteous,* or the performers of *good Works,* are here told, that they shall INHERIT *the Kingdom of Christ,* PREPARED FOR THEM *from the foundation of the World.* Who were these, here called, *Righteous?* Certainly such who had never heard of Christ, or been made acquainted with the terms of the Gospel; such who had obeyed the dictates of Natural Religion; and not having the LAW *of revealed Religion,* were (as the Apostle says) *a Law unto themselves.** This will appear evident to those who consider the nature and purpose of this *Representation* of the *last Judgment;* when all Nations, or the whole Race of Mankind, as well those who lived *before,* as those who came *after* the Advent of the Son of God, are to appear at his Judgment-Seat.

The tremendous Session, here represented, proceeds in order. They who lived *before* the coming of Christ, are the first who are set to the Bar, whether for reward, or for condemnation. They who

* Rom. ii. 14.

lived *after* were to come next. But, with the first, the Scene closes.

For Jesus had already explained *the terms of Salvation* to all the followers of the Gospel. Concerning the condition of these there could be no doubt. It might become a question amongst them, how those who had never heard of Christ were to be treated; and whether they were to be made partakers of the benefits of his Death and Passion; and likewise, upon what terms. To resolve those points, was the design of this moral Picture.

These *Righteous* are justified or saved. But how? surely not by FAITH. For, the Apostle tells us, that FAITH *cometh by hearing; and hearing by the word of God.** That is, "The doctrine of *justifying Faith* cannot be learnt from *Natural Religion;* but is to be taught by the Messengers of the *Revealed*, speaking by the Spirit of God." The *justification of these Righteous*, therefore, must needs be by WORKS; the natural foundation on which all revealed FAITH is built.

But to shew still more evidently, and sensibly, that the *Righteous*, in the Text, were those who had never heard of Christ, till they came to *Judgment*, we must observe, that as soon as they had been told what kind of WORKS they were which procured their Salvation, namely, administering to this their *Lord when he was a stranger, naked, sick, and in prison*, they are made to reply—*Lord, when saw we thee a stranger, naked, sick, and in prison?* A Question, which they, who, in this life, had heard of Christ, could never ask; since their *Lord* had often told his Followers, that the men who did any of these *good Works* to the least of their distressed Brethren, did them unto him: that is, gained the same benefit by them, as if done to himself.

In a word, this important REPRESENTATION instructs us in these two points of Doctrine: First, That the KINGDOM, whose blessings were produced by the death and passion of Christ, was secured to us *even from the foundation of the world;* and Secondly, That it was *actual Righteousness*, as well as *imputative*, which made those who had never heard explicitly of CHRIST, to become partakers of his merits.

CHAPTER IV.

HAVING now, at length, gone through this GENERAL VIEW OF THE NATURE AND GENIUS OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION; first, by an explanation of the MEANS by which we are enabled to recover the benefits lost by Adam's transgression; and, secondly, by an explanation of the CONDITION annexed to the enjoyment of those benefits, when recovered: We proceed to what remains of our *general*

* Rom. x. 17.

view. This Religion, as it was the LAST REVELATION of God's Will to Man, so it was the completion of all that preceded; and, therefore, when truly explained, must needs add the UTMOST FORCE AND LIGHT to every thing that, in the foregoing Volumes of the DIVINE LEGATION, hath been advanced, concerning the NATURE OF THE JEWISH DISPENSATION.

We have already observed how graciously the Divine Goodness displayed itself, in the RESTORATION of our *lost Inheritance*, by changing the *condition* annexed to eternal life, from something to be DONE, to something to be BELIEVED. And this was FAITH IN OUR REDEEMER. For by such a change, this important blessing became less subject to a new loss or danger.

But this was not all. The same bountiful Lord of life did, for its further security, impart to every true Believer, the strength and light of his HOLY SPIRIT to support FAITH *in working out our Salvation.**

Natural Reason, indeed, contemplating the attributes of the Deity, discovered to us, that when human abilities alone are too weak to support us in the performance and discharge of moral duty, God will lend his helping-hand to aid our sincere endeavours.

But to manifest to us with what more abundant measure this aid is dispensed, under the GOSPEL, our blessed *Redeemer* hath minutely explained all that relates to the PERSON and to the operations of the Divine Dispenser, called the HOLY SPIRIT; whom the FATHER and the SON have, for the further security of this recovered blessing, been pleased to associate with themselves in the administration of this œconomy. Which divine Person bears his share, with the other two, in the actual REDEMPTION OF MANKIND.

Thus far as to his NATURE. By which it appears, that this species of divine assistance, which our holy Religion calls GRACE, is to be understood as one of the *peculiar* blessings bestowed upon the FAITHFUL; and to be reckoned in that number. The words of St. John make this truth still more apparent. *This* (saith he) *Jesus spake of the* SPIRIT, *which they that believe on him should receive. For* THE HOLY GHOST WAS NOT YET GIVEN, BECAUSE THAT JESUS WAS NOT YET GLORIFIED.†

The OFFICE and OPERATION of this *holy Spirit*, is to support our *Faith* and to perfect our *Obedience*, by enlightening the *understanding*, and by purifying the *will*.

This, the blessed Jesus declares, where he professedly treats of the office of the *holy Spirit.—I will pray the Father* (says he) *and he shall give you another* COMFORTER, *that he may abide with you for ever; even the* SPIRIT OF TRUTH. *He dwelleth in you; and shall be*

* See "The Doctrine of Grace."

† John vii. 39.

in you—which is the HOLY GHOST; *whom the Father shall send in my name: he shall* TEACH YOU ALL THINGS.*

These are the two parts of his office: As the TEACHER, to impress upon the *understanding* all those practical and speculative truths, which constitute the sum and substance of our holy Religion; and as the COMFORTER, by purifying and supporting the *will*, to enable us to persevere in the profession of those truths that constitute the body of *moral righteousness;* the foundation (as we have shewn) of that JUSTIFYING FAITH, to which the Gospel hath annexed salvation or eternal life.

And the œconomy of the Gospel seemed to require, that when this Dispenser of divine assistance, the HOLY SPIRIT, was to be clearly revealed, and personally distinguished, as soon as Jesus was GLORIFIED,† his first descent, amongst the *Faithful*, should be attended with *signs* and *wonders*, to bear witness to the SANCTIFIER in the same way that they had borne witness to the REDEEMER. These signs were, in both cases, of the same nature, and performed for the same ends: First, for CREDENTIALS of their mission; and, secondly, INDICATIONS of their office.—"When the day of Pentecost was fully come, they [the Apostles] were all, with one accord, in one place; and suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them: and they were all filled with the HOLY GHOST; and began to speak with other tongues, as the SPIRIT gave them utterance."‡

This miracle manifested itself in the *gift of tongues*, to the astonished multitude, barbarous and civil, then casually assembled from every quarter of the habitable Globe, who heard the APOSTLES, (all natives or inhabitants of Galilee,) speaking to each of these Strangers, in his own mother tongue. And this being for the service and conviction of others, was, in its nature, TEMPORARY.§ Other effusions of the holy Spirit were PERMANENT; and these, instead of being conveyed *in a sound from heaven as of* A RUSHING MIGHTY WIND, were only conveyed and felt in the STILL, SMALL VOICE. For these were principally for the use and benefit of the favoured Receiver; who, although he himself was fully assured by them of the divine presence, yet could he give no sufficient evidence of that Presence to others.

Thus it appears, that this species of divine assistance, which our holy Religion calls GRACE, is to be considered as one of the *peculiar*

* John xiv. 26. † John vii. 39. ‡ Acts ii. 1, *et seq.* § See note K, at the end of this book.

blessings bestowed upon the *Faithful*. For, as hath been observed, the FATHER and the SON have been graciously pleased to associate, in the administration of this new œconomy, a *third divine Person*, called in Scripture the HOLY GHOST.

CHAPTER V.

THIS MIRACULOUS appearance of the HOLY SPIRIT, on his first *Descent*, naturally and happily leads us forward in this our *general view*; by bringing us to the consideration of the extraordinary manner in which it hath pleased Providence to promulge and propagate the Christian Faith.

Now, as it is apparent to common sense, that an immediate Revelation from Heaven can be firmly established no otherwise than by the intervention of MIRACLES; and, as we have found, by the sad experience of human corruption, that THIS SUPREME EVIDENCE of our holy Religion hath been fatally discredited by the contagion of *lying wonders*, deforming almost every age of the Church, it will be of the utmost importance to discover and fix the bounds of this *extraordinary interposition*.*

But a MIRACLE, even when best supported by human testimony, needeth to be still further qualified, ere it can deserve credit of a rational Believer: namely, that it be so connected with the system to which it claims relation, as that it be seen to make a part of it, or to be necessary to its completion.

It is otherwise, in Facts, acknowledged to be within the verge of nature and human agency. Here all that is wanted to recommend them to our belief, is the testimony of knowing and honest Witnesses.

While in pretended Facts beyond the verge of nature and human agency, such as those we call MIRACULOUS, much more is required when offered to our belief. The controul and arrest of the established Laws of Nature, by the God and Author of Nature, either mediately or immediately, is a thing which COMMON EXPERIENCE hath rendered so extremely improbable, that it will at least balance the very best human testimony, standing unsupported and alone. And why? Because ordinary Facts carry their CAUSES openly and manifestly along with them: Or if not so, yet none are required, as we are convinced their *causes* must be INTRINSECALLY there. But in Facts pretended to be *miraculous*, the immediate efficient cause is *extrinsecal*; and therefore leaves room for doubt and uncertainty: or rather, when, in this case, men perceive *no cause*, they are apt to conclude there is none; or, in other words, that the report is false and ground-

* "Discourse on the Resurrection."

less. So that when the *whole evidence* of the Fact, deemed *miraculous*, is solely comprised in human testimony, and is, in its nature, contrary to UNIFORM EXPERIENCE, the Philosopher will, at least, suspend his belief.

But though in all MIRACLES, that is, in Facts deemed miraculous, the EFFICIENT CAUSE continues unknown; yet, in those which our holy Religion seems to recommend to our belief, the FINAL CAUSE always stands apparent. And if *that cause* be so important as to make the *Miracle* necessary to the ends of the DISPENSATION, this is all that can be reasonably required to entitle it to our belief; when proposed to us with the same fulness of human testimony, which is sufficient to establish a common fact: since, in this case, we have the MORAL ATTRIBUTES OF THE DEITY to secure us from an error, so fatal to our welfare.*

And the confining our belief of *Miracles* within these bounds, wipes away (as I conceive) all the miserable sophistry of our modern pretenders to Philosophy, both at home and abroad, against MIRACLES, on pretence of their being contrary to GENERAL EXPERIENCE, in the ordinary course of things. At least, the TRUE PHILOSOPHER so thought, when he made that strict enquiry into Truth, towards the conclusion of his immortal Work—"Though COMMON EXPERIENCE" (says he) "AND THE ORDINARY COURSE OF THINGS have justly a mighty influence on the minds of men to make them give or refuse credit to any thing proposed to their belief; yet there is ONE CASE wherein the STRANGENESS of the facts LESSENS NOT THE ASSENT to a fair testimony given of it. For where SUPERNATURAL events are SUITABLE TO THE ENDS AIMED AT BY HIM who hath power to change the course of nature, *then*, under such circumstances, they may be FITTER to procure belief, by how much the more they are BEYOND OR CONTRARY TO ORDINARY OBSERVATION. This is the proper case of MIRACLES, which, well attested, do not only find credit themselves, *but give it also to other truths which need such confirmation.*" †

Now the MIRACLES, which Christianity objects to our belief, and which, therefore, demand credit of every reasonable man, are, and I apprehend must be, qualified in one or other of these three ways:

* Here, by the way, let me observe, that what is now said gives that CRITERION, which Dr. Middleton and his Opponents, in a late controversy concerning MIRACLES, demanded of one another; and which yet, both Parties, for some reasons or other, declined to give; namely, some certain mark to enable men to distinguish (for all the purposes of Religion) between true and certain *Miracles*, and those which were false or doubtful. † "LOCKE'S "Essay concerning Human Understanding," vol. ii. chap. "*Of* the Degrees of Assent," sect. xiii. p. 286.—This great man, we find, understood it to be apparent to common sense, that the belief of an immediate Revelation from Heaven could be firmly established no otherwise than by the aid of *Miracles*.—But see this truth proved more at large as we go along.

I.

They must either, in the first place, be such as Christ and his inspired Servants and Followers are recorded to have performed for the CREDENTIALS of their mission.

II.

Or, secondly, such as make a necessary part in, or towards the completion of the Gospel System.

III.

Or, thirdly and lastly, such as have been performed directly to manifest and VERIFY THE DIVINE PREDICTIONS, when impious men have set themselves on attempting to defeat them.

I.

When a *Miracle* is wrought (as in the first case) for the CREDENTIAL of a Messenger coming with the revealed Will of God, to Man, we may safely confide in it. Because *such* a Miracle is so far from being beneath the dignity of the occasion, that it is even necessary to answer the important purpose of it. Under this idea, it hath, I believe, been generally conceived in every age of our holy Religion, till the *present*. Indeed, it seems to have been the constant expectation of Believers, that these supernatural attestations should accompany every NEW MESSAGE from Heaven; insomuch that all the *pretended Revelations* in the Pagan World, as well as the *real* in the Jewish and the Christian, were constructed on this principle of credit.

But now, in these times, some there are even amongst the Ministers of the Gospel, who tell us, they think, or at least are hardy enough to teach, that the REASONABLENESS of the Doctrine is the best, and indeed the only true evidence of its divine Original.

If in this they should not be mistaken, I may, however, boast, that I, myself, have, in this Work, greatly strengthened this boasted plenitude of evidence.

But, in reverence to Truth, I hold myself obliged to own, that, in my opinion, the REASONABLENESS of a Doctrine pretended to come immediately from God, is, of itself alone, no PROOF, but a PRESUMPTION only of such its divine Original: because, though the *excellence* of a Doctrine (even allowing it to surpass all other moral teaching whatsoever) may shew it to be worthy of God, yet, from that sole *excellence*, we cannot certainly conclude that it came immediately from him; since we know not to what heights of moral knowledge the human understanding, unassisted by inspiration, may arrive. Not even our full experience, that all the Wisdom of Greece and Rome

comes extremely short of the Wisdom of the GOSPEL, can support us in concluding, with certainty, that this Gospel was sent immediately from God. We can but very doubtfully guess, what excellence may be produced by a well-formed and well-cultivated Mind, further blessed with a vigorous temperament, and a happy organization of the Body. The amazement into which Sir Isaac Newton's Discoveries, in Nature, threw the learned World, as soon as men became able to comprehend their Truth and Utility, sufficiently shews, what little conception it had, that the human faculties could ever rise so high or spread so wide.

On the whole, therefore, we conclude, that, strictly speaking, there is no ground of conviction solid and strong enough to bear the weight of so great an interest, but that which rises on MIRACLES, worked by the first Messengers of a new Religion, in support and confirmation of their MISSION.

That is, MIRACLES, and MIRACLES ONLY, demonstrate that the Doctrine, which is seen to be *worthy* of God, did, indeed, COME IMMEDIATELY from him.

To be plain, there is a glaring absurdity in the novel fancy here exposed; of which we can find no instance in the affairs of civil life—And civil and religious Policies are conducted on the same principles of Reason, while administered in their integrity. For what *public Person* ever imagined, or expected to have it believed, that the true and proper CREDENTIAL of a Minister of State was the fairness of his Character, or the equity of his demands? Nothing but the BROAD-SEAL of his Master, he knows, will satisfy those to whom he is sent, that he has a right to the Personage which he assumes. Doth not common sense tell us, that a Messenger from God must come recommended to Mankind in the same manner? Neither his personal accomplishments, nor the excellence of his Doctrine, nor, in a word, any thing short of the BROAD-SEAL of Heaven, exemplified in MIRACLES, will be sufficient to establish his assumed Character.

But the Doctors of this *new School* seem to have fallen into the absurdity here exposed, by another as ridiculous; namely, that THE GOSPEL ITSELF IS NO MORE, NOR OTHER, THAN A REPUBLICATION OF THE RELIGION OF NATURE: (an extravagance, amongst the first of those, which, I presume, this Work of the Divine Legation hath totally discredited.)

Now (say these men) if the light of Reason hath instructed us in what NATURAL RELIGION teacheth, it seems most consonant to common sense, that the REPUBLICATION of this Religion should be established in the same manner that it was first PUBLISHED to the world. NOT SO (I reply,) even on their false principle of a mere REPUBLICATION. For since it was found, by experience, that the

first publication of God's will, by natural light alone, hath proved insufficient to perpetuate the knowledge of it; we shall think it most adequate to Reason, that the REPUBLICATION should be better guarded; to secure it from the like mischance.

But the truth is, this idea of Christianity's being *merely such a* REPUBLICATION arose from the grossest ignorance of the GOSPEL; which reveals more, infinitely more important Truths than NATURAL LIGHT did or could discover. It reveals the whole scheme of *human Redemption;* which, till this *Revelation* took place, was a MYSTERY, kept hid amongst the Arcana of the Godhead.

However, the same Men have another objection to the belief of these *miraculous Credentials*. And the objection arises, it seems, from our SOPHISTICAL reasoning in support of them: for thus (they say) we argue—

"So little being known of the powers of created spirits, superior to ourselves, (some of which we are taught to believe are beneficent to man, and some averse) all that we can conclude of MIRACLES, considered only in themselves, is, that they are the work of agents, able, in some instances, to controul Nature, and divert her from her established course.—But whether this controul be performed immediately by the God of Nature, or by Agents acting under his direction, (which amounts to the same thing) or, on the contrary, by malignant agents, at enmity with Man, and, for a time, permitted to indulge their perverse and hurtful purposes, cannot be known but by the *nature of that Doctrine,* in support of which, the pretended MIRACLES are performed. The conclusion from this is, that THE MIRACLES ARE TO BE VERIFIED BY THE DOCTRINE."

But then, (say they, again) since we know so little of the extent of the human understanding, we cannot determine of the *true Original* of the Doctrine, proposed to our belief, till it be supported by MIRACLES; now the conclusion from this is, that the DOCTRINE IS TO BE VERIFIED BY MIRACLES.

Such is the vicious Circle (say our adversaries) round which we run, when we first PROVE THE MIRACLES BY THE DOCTRINE, AND THEN PROVE THE DOCTRINE BY THE MIRACLES.

This is, without doubt, *a Paralogism.* But we deny that any such faulty reasoning is here employed. The term, DOCTRINE, in the first proposition, is used to signify *a Doctrine agreeable to the truth of things, and demonstrated to be so by natural light.* In the second proposition, the term, DOCTRINE, is used to signify *a Doctrine immediately, and in an extraordinary manner,* revealed by God. So that these different significations, in the declared use of the word DOCTRINE, in the two propositions, sets the whole reasoning free from that *vicious Circle* within which our Philosophic Conjurers would con-

fine it. In this, there is no fruitless return of an unprogressive argument; but a regular procession of two distinct and different Truths, till the whole reasoning becomes compleat. In truth, they afford mutual assistance to one another; yet not by taking back, after the turn has been served, what they had given; but by continuing to hold what each had imparted to the support of the other.

On the whole, we conclude, that if any Messengers ever wanted the CREDENTIALS OF MIRACLES, they were the first MESSENGERS OF GOD in the revealed Mystery of the GOSPEL.

Indeed, divine Providence hath so strictly appropriated MIRACLES *for these* CREDENTIALS, that JOHN THE BAPTIST, the Precursor of those Messengers, destined only to announce the approaching GOSPEL, worked NO MIRACLES: yet, had *Miracles* been of no other use than what this new-fangled Doctrine assigns to them, namely, to make the hearers attentive to the excellence of the *morals* of the new Religion, none had more need of them than JOHN and his Penitents.—St. CHRYSOSTOM seems to have understood the GOSPEL better than these modern Divines, when he supposed that even JESUS himself worked no *Miracle* till after his baptism, *i. e.* till the time of his addressing himself to his Mission, when CREDENTIALS to his Character were naturally required; which *Credentials* had he not given, the unbelieving Jews, as he himself acknowledges, had been free from blame.—IF I HAD NOT DONE AMONGST THEM (says he) THE WORKS WHICH NONE OTHER MAN DID, THEY HAD NOT HAD SIN.*

II.

We come next to that second Species of *Miracles*, mentioned above, whose subject makes so essential a part in the Œconomy of the GOSPEL, that, without it, the whole would be vain and fruitless. The first and principal of the species is the MIRACLE of Christ's RESURRECTION from the Dead.—*If Christ be not* RAISED, (saith St. Paul) *your faith is vain; you are yet in your sins.*† And St. Peter uses the same argument to shew the NECESSITY of his Master's *resurrection.—God* (says he) *raised him up, having loosed the pains of death;* BECAUSE IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE THAT HE SHOULD BE HOLDEN OF IT.‡

Now from whence does the *impossibility* arise, if not from the force of St. Paul's argument concerning the nature of Christ's *Resurrection?*

So important a circumstance, therefore, required that the highest evidence should be given of its truth.

CHRISTIANITY reveals the restoration of lapsed and forfeited Man to life and immortality from the power and dominion of the Grave.

But the course of human nature continuing the same *after* this

* John xv. 24. † 1 Cor. xv. 17. ‡ Acts ii. 24.

restoration which it held *before*, and the GRAVE still boasting its power, though foolishly, indeed, and in vain, *since Death had lost its Sting*; * there seemed to be need of some extraordinary evidence of the *reality of this change* in the order of things, which being procured at the price of Christ's death on the Cross, and then visibly paid, the nature of the compact required that the benefit obtained should be as visibly put into our possession; and both one and the other openly exemplified in the same Person, the *Author of our Salvation*. For, if he himself was not seen to enjoy the fruits of that Redemption, which was of his own procuring, what hopes could be entertained for the rest of mankind? Would it not have been too plausibly concluded, that this expedient of *Redemption* had proved ineffectual by CHRIST'S not *rising?* So necessarily connected (in the Apostle's opinion) was the MIRACLE of the Saviour's visible *resurrection* with the very essence of the Christian Faith. And this *Resurrection being the first fruits of them that slept*, was the very thing which both assured and sanctified all the benefits that were to follow. For the *Jewish first fruits* (to which the expression alludes) were of the nature, and a security to the plenty, of the approaching Harvest.

Thus, we see, the MIRACLE of the *Resurrection* made a necessary part of the integrity of the Gospel.

But it had other uses and expediencies besides; which, (in concluding this head,) I shall, in as few words as possible, endeavour to point out. The heathen World had, in general, some notion of another life. But a *resurrection* of this *material* body, after death, to accompany the soul in its future existence, never once entered into their imaginations; though some modern Writers have been misled to think otherwise, partly by what they had learnt of the *fables of the vulgar*, full of shadows of a bodily shape, Inhabitants of the Tombs, or Attendants on the *Soul*, in the sequestered abode of Spirits; and partly of the more solemn dreams of the Philosophers, particularly the famous STOICAL RENOVATION, which, however, is so far from bearing any resemblance, or yielding any credit to the CHRISTIAN resurrection, though mistaken for it, that it is absolutely inconsistent with it.

The Sages of Antiquity had discovered many qualities in the human *Soul*, which disposed them to think that it might survive the *Body*. But every property they knew of *Matter* led them to conclude, that, at the separation and dissolution of the union between these two constituent parts of Man, the *Body* would be resolved into the Elements from whence it arose. And that sect of Philosophy which most favoured, and best cultivated the Doctrine of the Soul's immor-

* 1 Cor. xv. 55.

tality, considered the Body only as its *prison*, into which it was thrust, by way of penance, for its pre-existent crimes; and from which, when it had undergone its destined purgation, it was to be totally set free. Nay, so little did the RESURRECTION OF THE BODY enter into their more studied conceptions, that when St. Paul, at Athens, (the capital Seat of Science,) preached JESUS AND THE RESURRECTION,* his Auditors mistook the second term to be like the first, a revelation of some new Deity, a certain Goddess called ANASTASIS.†

With all these prejudices, so unfavourable to the RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, nothing less than the assurance of the best attested MIRACLE, in confirmation of it, could have reconciled the Gentile World to the belief of so incredible a Doctrine.

This we say with the greater confidence, since St. Paul himself, on this occasion, appears to argue on the same idea. For when he had rectified this error of the Athenians, concerning *Jesus and the resurrection*, and had informed them that, by this *resurrection*, he meant the revival of the *dead bodies* of men, and restoration of them to life, he adds—*whereof God hath given* ASSURANCE *unto all men, in that he raised Jesus from the dead.—For after his resurrection, he was seen* (says the same Apostle, on another occasion) *of five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present.*‡

2. Under this second division of *Miracles*, whose subject makes an essential part in the Œconomy of the Christian dispensation, let me recommend to your consideration and belief the power of Jesus and his Disciples to CAST OUT DEVILS OR EVIL SPIRITS from the bodies of Men suffering by those inhospitable Guests.§

And under this division I the rather chuse to place this species of

* Acts xvii. 31. † In this sense St. CHRYSOSTOM understood the thoughts of the Athenians to be concerning St. Paul's mention of the *Anastasis*. Dr. BENTLEY thinks otherwise. But which of these two Doctors was likely to be best acquainted with the genius and state of Paganism, when St. Paul preached at Athens, must be left to the judgment of the Reader. This, at least, is certain, that the reason the modern Doctor gives, why the *Athenians could not mistake* ANASTASIS *for a Goddess, because they too well understood the notion of a resurrection*, is a very weak one, since they had no notion of a *resurrection* at all; unless they mistook (which is very unlikely) the STOICAL RENOVATION for that which the Apostle preached. Dr. Bentley, indeed, seems to have fallen into that error, or he could scarce have said—*the Athenians well understood the notion of a Resurrection*. However, let the Athenians understand this *Stoical renovation* as they would, they were certainly liable to a folly as gross, and at that time much more general, which was, the turning *a moral entity into an object of worship*: most of which abstract notions, superstition had thus metamorphosed. Amongst the JEWS, indeed, the RESURRECTION was become a national Doctrine some time before the advent of the MESSIAH; not collected (we may be sure) from natural reason, nor taught them by their *Scriptures*, yet collected from the contemplation of their Prophets misinterpreted; where the *restoration of the Mosaic Republic* was predicted, in terms which were mistaken by the latter Jews, to signify the revival or resurrection of the Bodies of their deceased Ancestors; of which many instances might be given, besides Ezekiel's *Vision of the dry bones*. ‡ 1 Cor. xv. 6. § "Sermon" *On the Fall of Satan*.

Miracles, since, by occasion of a very general and infamous pretence of such a power, especially in these later times, the fact itself has been rendered doubtful; and even excluded from the number of those mental and bodily disorders, recorded by the Evangelists, to have been relieved in the most extraordinary manner by Jesus and his Disciples —*And they brought unto him all sick people* (says St. Matthew) *that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were* POSSESSED WITH DEVILS AND LUNATICS, *and he healed them.**—Insomuch that at length we have been told, that what is here called the being *possessed with Devils*, was, indeed, no other than an atrabilaire Lunacy, or one of those *occult distempers* for which Physicians could not find a remedy, or, what was still harder, were at a loss for a *name;* and therefore, in complaisance to the imbecility of their Patients, they agreed to suppose it *supernatural*, or, (saving your presence) *the work of the Devil.*

But this strange Malady being delivered to us as a REAL POSSESSION by the Evangelist last quoted, who, at the same time, distinguishes it from *natural* disorders, and particularly from LUNACY, with which these modern Doctors are willing to confound it, we chuse to adhere to the opinion of the sacred Writer.

In support of which, and to form a right judgment of the matter in question, it may be proper to consider what adverse part the DEVIL bore in disturbing the Œconomy of Grace.

Now, in the History of the FALL, recorded by Moses, to which the Writers of the New Testament perpetually allude, SATAN, or the *Tempter*, *Calumniator*, the old Serpent, or the *evil One*, (for by these names he is characterized in Scripture,) is represented as having instigated the *first man*, Adam, to disobedience; for which, by the *second Adam*, Jesus Christ, (who restored us to our lost inheritance,) is denounced his punishment in these figurative terms, *the Seed of the Woman should bruise the Serpent's head:* † explained in the New Testament, to be the final conquest and destruction of this enemy of mankind by our *Redeemer*. So that we may reasonably expect to find the *punishment* of the *Tempter* recorded in the History of our REDEMPTION, as his *crime* was recorded in the History of the FALL. And, indeed, this circumstance, so necessary to the story of the whole transaction, we meet with in the Gospel, on several occasions.

When the Disciples, whom Jesus had sent out to renounce their Mission, came back to their Master exulting in the power of their Ministry, he receives them as Conquerors, returning in triumph from their spiritual warfare—*I beheld* SATAN (says he) *as lightning fall from heaven.*‡ A strong and lively picture of the sudden precipita-

* Matt. iv. 24. † Gen. iii. 15. ‡ Luke x. 18.

tion of that *Prince of the Air* from the place where he had so long held his usurpation, hanging like a pestilential meteor over the sons of men.

The rise, therefore, of Christ's Kingdom, and the fall of Satan's, being thus carried on together, it would be strange indeed, if, in the Gospel, we should find no MARKS of the rage of Satan's expiring tyranny amidst all the salutary blessings of the rising Empire of Christ. But we find them in abundance. We find this enemy of our salvation, mad with despair, invoking all the powers of darkness to blast that *peace and good will towards men,* proclaimed by Angels on the birth-night of the Son of God. For when he understood, by his baffled attempts on his Lord and Master, that the SOULS of men had escaped his usurped Dominion, he turned his cruelty on their BODIES, in the most humiliating circumstances of pain and oppression that could dishonour or disgrace humanity: permitted, no doubt, to take a wider range at this decisive instant than at any other, either before or since, in order to illuminate the glories of his Conqueror.

Had the *first Adam* stood in the rectitude of his Creation, he had, on observing the Command given to him in Paradise, gained IMMORTALITY, and been placed above and beyond the reach of NATURAL and MORAL evil. His relapse back to MORTALITY brought *both* into the world. The office of the *second Adam* was to restore us to our Paradisaical State. But as the *immortality,* purchased for us by the Son of God, was unlike to that which became forfeit by the transgression of the *first man* in this particular, that it was not to commence immediately, but was reserved for the reward of a future state, it followed that both *physical* and *moral* evil were to endure for a season. Yet, to manifest that they were, in good time, to receive their final doom from the REDEEMER, it seems essential to his character that he should, in the course of his Ministry, give a convincing specimen of his power over *both.*

One part, therefore, of his Godlike labours was, we find, employed in curing all kinds of *natural* diseases. But had he stopped here amidst his conquests over *physical* evil, the full evidence of his Dominion over *both Worlds,* which, by his office, he was to restore to their primeval integrity, had remained defective.

Jesus, therefore, was to display his Sovereignty over *moral evil* likewise; and this could not be seen in the manner it was manifested over *natural* evil, but by a sensible Victory over SATAN; through whose machinations *moral evil* was brought into the World, and by whose temptations it was sustained and increased.

Hence it was that, amongst his amazing works of sanity and salvation, the CASTING OUT OF DEVILS is so much insisted on by the Writers of his life and death; he himself having informed them, that

it was essential to the erection of his spiritual Kingdom—*If I* (says he) *cast out Devils by the Spirit of God,* THEN *the Kingdom of God is come unto you.**

Thus, from the very genius of the GOSPEL, from the nature and constitution of the System of GRACE, it appears that this was a real ejection of the *evil Spirit.*

But, besides this, Jesus and his Disciples, in their manner of working, and in the mode of recording what they worked, did every thing that might best display a real victory over SATAN.

Let the *Jews* of that time, let the *diseased* themselves, be as much in an error as you are pleased to conceive them, in the matter of *Diabolical Possession,* yet no Believer will presume to think that JESUS was deceived in his own case; or was disposed to deceive others, when he informed his Historians of his *being led by the Spirit into the Wilderness, and of his being tempted there forty days of the* DEVIL.†—Whether any, or what part of this transaction passed in Vision, is not material to determine, since the *reality of the agency* is the same on either supposition; as its truth depended not on the mode of sensation, but on the infallible assurance of that agency. For Jesus, in his amazing humiliation, when he assumed *our nature,* was yet, without doubt, superior to those infirmities of it which arise from the delusions of sense; as such delusions would have been incompatible with the exercise of his divine Ministry. If, therefore, there was any mistake in this matter, it must be (I speak it with the most reverential horrour) the designed contrivance of our blessed Master himself, who assures us, that *he was* not only *the way,* but THE TRUTH ‡ likewise.

So far then is clear, that the *evil Spirit* was neither absent nor inactive when the Gospel was first opened to mankind.

In THIS TEMPTATION, he was permitted to try whether he could traverse the great work of human Redemption—*In his possession of men's bodies,* he seems to have been, in part, forced upon the attempt, that *the casting of him out,* by the power of Jesus, might evince Mankind that our restoration to LIFE was fully accomplished.

Thus, in the case of the man possessed in the country of the Gadarines,—The Devils, oppressed by the mighty hand of God, and ready to be cast out and sent into a place of torment, confess the superiority of their conqueror, and proclaim him to be the promised MESSIAH, at a time when he concealed this part of his Character, and was not certainly known by it even amongst his Disciples.

If it be asked, why the Devils proclaimed it? The answer is easy: It was to impede, or to cut off, the course of his appointed Ministry. On this account Jesus checks, or enjoins silence to them. Indeed,

* Matt. xii. 28. † Luke iv. 1, 2. ‡ John xiv. 6.

had all the attestation given by our Saviour to *real possessions* been no stronger than that which he gave in answer to those who said, He cast out Devils by Baalzebub, namely, that then, *Baalzebub's kingdom being divided within itself, must be brought to destruction,** the argument might be thought to labour a little; for if the power and operation of *Satan* or *Baalzebub* was a groundless fancy, as our Philosophers pretend, Jesus may not unreasonably be thought to argue *ad hominem;* which a Messenger from God might do without impeachment of his Character, though the concession on which he reasons were not strictly conformable to the reality of things. But when such a Messenger commands the Devils, whom he pretends to have cast out, not to discover his office or character, this is going a length, if there was no Devil in the case, which a Messenger from the God of Truth could never, surely, be authorised to engage in.

If we turn from Satan's *temptation* of Jesus to his cruel treatment of the Jews, we shall still find the same strong marks of *real agency*.

Be it granted, that both the Jews and Gentiles of that time were grown very fanciful and superstitious concerning *diabolic possessions*, and, consequently, that they often mistook *natural* for *supernatural* maladies; what follows, but that which we find provided against those false conclusions which weak or licentious men drew from thence?

The utmost care and attention has been given by the sacred Writers to *mark* out those cases of real possession, which Jesus relieved, by some circumstance not equivocal, or what could not accompany an imaginary or natural disorder.

Thus, in the adventure recorded by three of the Evangelists†—when Jesus had eased the Demoniac, and his tormentors had obtained leave to go into *a herd of swine;* what other reason can be given, or, indeed, what better can be conceived, of their extraordinary request on the one hand, or permission on the other, than that this circumstance was to afford a certain MARK to distinguish a REAL from an *imaginary* Possession?

It is true, that the wild extravagance of human fancy may be able to form chimeras that shall affright the Raiser of them to distraction. Yet Brutes (we all know) have none of this dangerous faculty. Therefore, when we find great numbers of them stimulated, at once, to an instantaneous madness, we must needs conclude, that it was caused by some supernatural Agent, operating on their organs.

So admirably has our indulgent Master been pleased to guard this important Truth against the most plausible evasions of self-conceited men.

The strong impulse of a vitiated fancy, pushed forward by super-

* Matt. xii. 24, et seq. † Matt. viii.; Mark v.; Luke viii.

stition, might be supposed able, without other agency, to produce these very extraordinary appearances.

To cut off, therefore, all escape from a forced concession of the mighty hand of God, compelling his most *averse* Creatures to acknowledge his Sovereignty, here are two cases obtruded on the most incredulous: The one is, SATAN'S temptation of the Messiah; the other is, his *Possession* of brute Animals: In neither of which cases hath the *powers of imagination* any place. In the *first*, the divine Patient was above their delusions; in the *other*, the Brutal was as much below them.

If we turn from the FACTS which the Evangelists have recorded, to the EXPRESSIONS which they have employed, we shall have further reason to rest satisfied with the ancient interpretation.

The text says,—*They brought unto him all sick people, that were taken with divers diseases and torments: and* THOSE WHICH WERE POSSESSED WITH DEVILS, *and* LUNATICS; *and he healed them.*

Here we find, that the disorder of those who are said to be POSSESSED WITH DEVILS, is precisely distinguished, not only from natural diseases and torments in general, but likewise from LUNACY in particular; that very disorder which the Antidemoniast is so willing to confound with supernatural agitations. Is it possible, therefore, to believe, that a Writer of any meaning, at the very time he is distinguishing *Lunacy* from *diabolical Possessions*, should confound these two disorders with one another? Yet, this is what these licentious Critics make him do, in compliance (they tell us) with an accustomed mode of speech. On the contrary, is it not certain, that the sacred Writer was the more intent to represent them as two very different disorders, for this very reason, their having many symptoms in common? a circumstance which hath made these men solicitous to *confound* what the Evangelist was careful to *distinguish*.

In a word, they who, after all these precautions taken by St. Matthew, and the rest, can believe that *Devils* and *Demoniacs* were used only as terms of accommodation, may well believe (as some of them profess to do) that the terms *Sacrifice*, *Redemption*, and *Satisfaction*, come of no better a House than one of the common figures of speech.*

III.

We now come to the third and last Class of MIRACLES, which, we say, demand the assent of every reasonable man, when proposed to him with full evidence of the Fact.

Of this kind are the *Miracles* in which the Deity immediately interposes, to vindicate the Credit of his own Predictions, when impious men have publicly combined to defeat and dishonour them.

* See note L, at the end of this book.

The most eminent of this Class was the *miraculous* interposition of Heaven, which defeated JULIAN'S attempt to rebuild THE JEWISH TEMPLE OF JERUSALEM.

When God found it expedient or necessary, in order to preserve the Memory and keep up the Knowledge of himself amidst a corrupt world, running headlong into Polytheism and Idolatry, he chose a single Family, which, when spread out into a Nation or People, was to become the public repository of his holy Name, till the fulness of time should come, when, as he *promised by himself, all the earth should be filled with the glory of the Lord.**

This family was of the seed of Abraham; which, in compliance with the religious notions of those times, he was pleased to adopt for his peculiar People, under the idea of their *tutelar* Deity, or the *God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob;* and, the more effectually to secure the great end of their separation, assumed, likewise, the title and office of their KING or CIVIL GOVERNOR; having, first of all, communicated himself to them, as the Maker and Governor of the Universe.

Hence, the RELIGION he gave unto this People came under the idea of a LAW; and the LAW, amongst them, was, in the strictest sense, RELIGION, as having all the sanctions of a divine Command.

From this short account of the JEWISH CONSTITUTION it appears, that RELIGION, which, elsewhere, had properly and justly *particulars only* for its subjects, had here the nation or community. And what, elsewhere, (as far as concerns the divine origin of Religion) is only a *private* matter, was here a public. For the Deity being both their *tutelary God* and *Civil Governor*, the proper object of his care was, in either capacity, the collective Body.

Hence it follows, that the principal Rites of the Hebrew *Religion* and *Law* were to be performed in some determined Place. For the ideas of a *tutelary* God and *civil* Governor implied a local Residence; and a *national act*, arising from the relations springing out of these qualities, required a fixed and certain habitation for its celebration; and both together seemed to mark out the Capital of the Country for that use.

Such a practice, which the nature and reason of things so evidently point out, the Institutes of the Jewish Law expressly direct and enjoin.

During the early and unsettled times of the Republic, the Sacrifices prescribed by its Ritual were directed to be offered up at the door of an ambulatory *Tabernacle;* but when the People had perfected the Establishment ordained for them, and a magnific TEMPLE was erected for religious Worship, then their SACRIFICES were to be offered in that place at Jerusalem only.

* Num. xiv. 21.

Now, SACRIFICES constituting the essentials of their Worship, their *Religion* could not be said to exist longer than that celebration continued. But *Sacrifices* were to be performed in no place out of the Walls of their TEMPLE. So that when this *holy place* was finally destroyed, according to the prophetical predictions, the INSTITUTION itself became abolished. Nor was any thing more consonant to the genius of this Religion, than the assigning such a celebration of its principal Rites. The Temple would exist while they remained a People, and continued Sovereign. And when their Sovereignty was lost, the Temple-worship became precarious, and subject to the arbitrary pleasure of their Masters.—They destroyed this Temple: but it was not till it had lost its use. For the Rites, directed to be there celebrated, were relative to them only as a free-policied People.

So that this was, in reality, a total EXTINCTION of the Jewish Worship. How wonderful are the ways of God! This came to pass at that very period when a *new Revelation* from Heaven concurred with the blind transactions of civil policy, to supersede the LAW by the introduction of the GOSPEL: the last great work which completed the Scheme of HUMAN REDEMPTION.

To confound this admirable order of Providence was what induced the EMPEROR JULIAN to attempt the REBUILDING the JEWISH TEMPLE OF JERUSALEM. The vanity of the attempt could be only equalled by its impiety: for it was designed TO GIVE THE LIE TO GOD, who, by the mouth of his Prophets, had foretold that it should never be rebuilt. Here then was the most important occasion for a miraculous interposition, as it was to defeat this mad attempt. And thus in fact it was defeated, to the admiration of all mankind.

But as a large and full account of the whole affair hath been already given to the Public, in a Work entituled—JULIAN, *or a Discourse concerning the Earthquake and fiery Eruption which defeated that Emperor's Attempt to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem;* thither I refer the learned Reader, who will there meet with all the various evidence of the Fact, abundantly sufficient to support and establish it; together with a full confutation of all the cavils opposed to its certainty and necessity.

To conclude this subject with a recapitulation of what I undertook to prove, namely, that the MIRACLES in the Christian Dispensation, which exact credit of reasonable men, may be all comprised under one or other of these Divisions, viz.

I. Under that SPECIES OF MIRACLES which serves for CREDENTIALS to the MISSION of Jesus Christ and his first Disciples and Followers.

II. Or under that which makes an essential part in the integrity or completion of the Gospel-System.

III. Or, lastly, under that in which the Deity immediately inter-

poses, to vindicate the credit of his own predictions, when impious Men have entered into a combination to defeat and dishonour them.

Not that it is my purpose positively to brand, as FALSE, every pretended Miracle recorded in ecclesiastical and civil History, which wants this favourable capacity of being reduced to one or other of the *Species* explained above. All that I contend for is, that those Miracles, still remaining unsupported by the nature of that Evidence which I have shewn ought to force conviction from every reasonable Mind, should be at present excluded from the privilege of that conviction.

Indeed the greater part may be safely given up, for idle and knavish tales of monkish invention.

Of the rest, which yet stand undiscredited by any considerable marks of Imposture, we may safely suspend our belief, till time hath afforded further lights to direct our judgment.

Nor will the confining our Assent to *Miracles*, thus brought within the limits of an apparent SUFFICIENT CAUSE, be less beneficial to *Religion* in general, than it is subversive of the vain *Philosophy* in vogue, which attempts to discredit all extraordinary interpositions of Providence whatsoever, as we shall now shew.

1. The bringing MIRACLES within these bounds will afford a mark of distinction, never to be effaced, between those of the GOSPEL, and those which PAGANISM and its *Advocates* object to us. For I may venture to affirm, that, amongst those pretended Miracles in the Pagan World, there cannot be found one that carries along with it any thing that bears the least resemblance to a SUFFICIENT CAUSE. And there is strong reason to believe, that the Deity, without such an occasion, would never interfere amongst the Gentiles; because such an interposition would, besides the vanity of it, have a natural and direct tendency to rivet men in their idolatry.

But the principal use of confining MIRACLES within these bounds will be the giving an immediate check to FRAUD and SUPERSTITION, when in their full career, to abuse and enslave a foolish World. For that strange infirmity of the human mind, viz. *a fondness for the* MARVELLOUS (begot by a misconception of nature, and nursed by the pride of self-importance), always made the deluded multitude thankless and averse to those who would bring them to their senses;

— Cui sic extorta voluptas.

And if Men be so fond of the *Marvellous* for the mere pleasure of the ADMIRATION which it creates, what must be their zeal to propagate those *strange things*, in which Religion is supposed to be concerned? Every disorderly passion now conspires to blot and deform the fair face of Nature, with Prodigies and Portents.

Such frightful Visions, even the earliest Ages of Christianity raised

up. *The Prodigies of* ANTICHRIST (says the Apostle) *have been after the working of Satan, with* POWERS *and* SIGNS *and* LYING WONDERS.*

This, it is true, should make THEOLOGIANS cautious; but it should not make our PHILOSOPHERS presumptuous or vain. For even these Intimados of Nature know no more of Her than what lies just before them, in common with those whom they most affect to despise: And all they know, if not a MIRACLE, is yet a MYSTERY.

Let these her closet-acquaintance *steal*, as they are able, to her inmost recesses, they *can bring nothing* from thence concerning God's natural and moral Government, as the Poet finely expresses it,

—BUT UNDECYPHERED CHARACTERS,

which only teach us the need we have of a better Decypherer, than that REASON on which these men so proudly rely.

CHAPTER VI.

BUT now, besides these extraordinary Gifts, properly called MIRACLES, with which the first Preachers of the *Gospel* were intrusted, for its more speedy propagation, they were endowed with another, and more complicated kind of supernatural Power, namely PROPHECY, in which a MIRACULOUS power was eminently included.

With PROPHECY, or with that simpler species of divine Virtue, MIRACLES, was the Church of Christ at that time supplied; as one or the other was best suited to the various uses of Religion.

In explaining this matter, which the importance of the subject requires us to do more at large, it will be necessary just to repeat what has been observed before; that, in the first propagation of a *new Religion* from Heaven, the Will of God must be attested by MIRACLES; since nothing less than this instant Evidence is sufficient to assure us of its divine original.

But when this hath been fully and largely afforded, the *power of Miracles* (where *Miracles* do not make a constant and essential part in the nature of the *Dispensation*, as they did in the *Jewish)* is with good reason withdrawn from the Servants and Ministers of Religion: And the CHURCH is from thenceforth left, at least for some time, to support itself on the TRADITIONAL EXEMPLIFICATION of this evidence: something less forcible than the ORIGINAL RECORD, of which the first and better ages of Christianity had been in possession.

But by the time this MIRACULOUS power began to fail, another was preparing to supply its place, of still greater efficacy; I mean, that of PROPHECY.

For the sovereign Master, who no less manifests his constant PRESENCE to the *moral* than to the *physical* government of the

* 2 Thess. ii. 9.

World, has been graciously pleased to give to the *later* ages of the Church more than an equivalent for what he had bestowed upon the *earlier*, in beginning to shower down on his chosen servants of the NEW COVENANT the riches of PROPHECY as the power of working MIRACLES abated. So early, I say, was this preparation made for that stronger and more lasting support; a support not yet, indeed, improved into *Evidence;* nor was the *Evidence* wanted, while *Miracles*, in a sort, remained. Besides, it could not, in the nature of things, become *Evidence*, till some time after its first enunciation: for till the more considerable events of a PROPHECY, which contained the future and later fortunes of the *Gospel*, had arisen, and been brought, by degrees, into EXISTENCE, the *Prophecy* could afford no conviction of its truth.

Yet, in this wonderful disposition of things, we see the *divine Hand* by which they were conducted.

To proceed. PROPHECIES were now more clearly and simply, now more obscurely and enigmatically enounced, just as the nature of the subject or the circumstances of the time required.—Yet still we have ventured to call PROPHECY a stronger and more lasting Evidence than MIRACLES. And this will deserve our attention. The evidence from MIRACLES seems, by its nature, to lessen somewhat by time; while that from PROPHECY gathers strength by it, and grows more and more convictive, till the gradual and full completion of all its parts makes the splendour of it irresistible.

Hence the wisdom of the divine Disposer is still further seen, in making PROPHECY, not only the *strongest*, but the LAST and CONCLUDING Evidence of a *Religion*, which, as it was the completion of the whole scheme of REVELATION, so having (as it would seem) the largest portion of its course yet to run, that species of Evidence which does not lose, but gain strength, by time, was best fitted to accompany it to its utmost period.

But to go on with our more general reflections on the whole.

This DOUBLE EVIDENCE, in support of *Revealed Religion*, hath always been the same throughout every mode of God's moral Dispensations. The records of sacred History confirm this Truth.

Under the Jewish œconomy, although MIRACLES, by reason of the peculiar form of the Republic, were necessarily attendant on its administration, throughout a course of many ages (that is, during all the time in which the affairs of this people were conducted by an *extraordinary Providence)*, yet God's inspired Servants were, together with the power of working MIRACLES, endowed with the gift of PROPHECY. For, although the *extraordinary Providence*, and consequently MIRACLES, which made a part of it, continued much longer than would have been necessary, had MIRACLES amongst the Jews

been of no other use than they were in the Christian Church, viz. to evidence the divinity of the Revelation; yet as *that Providence*, and consequently this *miraculous* attendant on it, were to cease long before the abolition of the THEOCRACY; the other evidence of PROPHECY, in the absence of MIRACLES, was graciously bestowed on the Jewish Church likewise.

Hence the inspired Ministers of it, DANIEL in particular, foretold more circumstantially and minutely than the rest, the various fortunes of that Church and Republic, from its decay, in their own times, to the entire dissolution of it by the introduction of a better SYSTEM.

In the like manner St. JOHN, under the NEW COVENANT, did, by the same divine Spirit, predict the fortunes of the *Christian Church*, from the flourishing condition of it, in his own time, through all the disasters of the corrupt ages that followed, to the happy consummation of all things.

In both cases, for the reasons above given, PROPHECY could not be urged as instant evidence, at the time it was delivered, but was kept entire and reserved for the use of those ages, when MIRACLES having long ceased in the *Christian* Church, and were declining in the *Jewish*, seemed to need this other and further support.

From all these, and from many other considerations to be further urged, it will appear, that, of this double Evidence to the truth of Revelation, viz. MIRACLES and PROPHECY, the latter, as we have said, is of superior force and efficacy.

We have already shewn its superiority in gaining by *Time* what the other loses. This advantage is further seen by its being less subject to the mistakes and fallacious impressions of *sense* than *Miracles* are.

But as this is a matter of much importance, it may be proper to explain and verify the assertion.

Both MIRACLES and PROPHECIES are indeed appeals to the *Senses*, but with this difference, that MIRACLES, however illustrious, such as those worked by the first propagators of our holy Religion, are subject to the cavils of Infidelity.

Of this, Dr. Middleton hath afforded a wonderful example; where he insinuates, and would seem to persuade us, that the *Voice from Heaven recognizing the Son of God*, was no other than a superstitious fancy of the later Jews called the BATH KOL; a fantastic kind of Divination of their own invention.—As groundless and scandalous as this cavil is, yet it must be owned, that the frame of the animal œconomy, in which a heated imagination is able to work strange appearances in the body, has given some countenance to infidelity, in its sceptical conclusions against *Miracles*. And though we have said enough to free those of the *Gospel*, and some others, confined within the reasonable bounds before laid down, from every imputation of this

sort, yet *Miracles* being, by their very nature, open and liable to abusive interpretations, and *Prophecy* well secured from them, for this, and for the more weighty reasons given above, we conclude (as the crown of all) with the unerring declaration of the holy Apostle PETER; who, in his second general Epistle to the Churches, alluding to this *twofold evidence* for the truth of Revelation, namely MIRACLES and PROPHECY, after he had ended what he thought fit to say of the *first*, proceeds to the *other* in these words—WE HAVE ALSO A MORE SURE WORD OF PROPHECY—ἔχομεν ΒΕΒΑΙΟΤΕΡΟΝ τὸν ΠΡΟΦΗΤΙΚΟΝ λόγον—*a word, that may be more firmly relied on, and whose existence is more durable.* The word, βεβαιότερον, including both these senses. And we have shewn that the nature of PROPHECY contains these two qualities.

And they being most eminently comprised in the CAPITAL PROPHECY here described and characterised; a more particular explanation of it may be naturally expected in this GENERAL VIEW of the Christian Religion.—

"We have not followed *cunningly devised fables*" (says the Apostle, ver. 16.) "when we made known unto you the COMING AND POWER of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his Majesty.

17. "For he received from God, the Father, honour and glory, when there was a VOICE to him, from the exceeding glory—This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

18. "And this *voice* which came from Heaven, we heard when we were with him in the mount.

19. "WE HAVE ALSO A MORE SURE WORD OF PROPHECY: whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, *as unto a light, shining in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts.*"

*There are few places, in the Scriptures of the New Testament, plainer than this before us; and yet there are none where interpreters have wandered further from the Apostle's meaning.†

This hath been principally owing to a mistake of the subject. These Interpreters supposed that St. PETER was here speaking of the PERSONAL CHARACTER OF JESUS; and thence concluded, that THE MORE SURE WORD OF PROPHECY, whereby he strengthens his argument, respected the *Prophecies* of the OLD TESTAMENT, which establish that PERSONAL CHARACTER.

But the Apostle is treating of a different thing; namely, of THE TRUTH OF THE GOSPEL IN GENERAL.

Which shews, that *the more sure word of Prophecy* regards a Prophecy of the NEW TESTAMENT.

One mistake produced, of course, another. For, on supposition,

* From this place to the end, abridged and altered from Sermon *On the Rise of Antichrist.*—R. W. † See the altercations between Bishop Sherlock and Dr. Middleton, and their respective Advocates.

that the *personal Character of Jesus* was the thing meant, it would follow, that *by the power and coming of our Lord*, we are to understand his FIRST COMING; and then, indeed, *the word of Prophecy* must needs signify a Prophecy ALREADY FULFILLED. But nothing is more certain than that the *Character* here given of that *Prophecy*, to which the Church is admonished to *take heed*, or pay its attention, confines us to one, but now, just beginning to attest its divine original —*it is a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in our hearts;* that is, till a long series of events (yet in the womb of time) shall arise, to give testimony, by degrees, till the whole evidence concludes in one unclouded blaze of conviction. So that *the power and coming of our Lord* must needs mean his SECOND COMING.

Yet amongst the Interpreters just before censured, there are some more eminently absurd* than the rest. One of these is even desirous to have it believed, that by this *more sure word of Prophecy* is to be understood the Prophecy of ISAIAH, chap. xlii. ver. 1. although the Apostle has characterised this to be *a light shining in a dark place*, &c. *i. e.* not as convictive evidence at present, yet being a LIGHT, though *shining in a dark place*, it deserved our attention, till greater *lights* should arise, which would afford full conviction.

Now, could this be the *Character* of a Prophecy of the *Old Testament;* especially one of ISAIAH'S, most of whose Predictions referred to, and had their completion in, JESUS, their great object? The *dawn* and *day-star*, here spoken of by the Apostle, as of a very distant light, was, in the time of that Prophet, already *risen* in the hearts of his countrymen, or it would never rise.

Let us, therefore, look out for some more reasonable Paraphrase of the sacred Text.—

—"That you may be assured" (says the Apostle) "we have not *followed cunningly devised fables*, when we described to you the power of our Lord at his SECOND COMING, you should recollect what we have frequently told you, of his FIRST; having been eye-witnesses of the Majesty and *Miracles* attending it, *when there came a voice to him from the exceeding glory*, &c.—Now, the MIRACLES, which accompanied, and confirmed his mission, on his FIRST COMING, are surely sufficient to gain credit to what we have, as often, told you, of his SECOND. And, of this capital Truth, God hath been graciously pleased to add still stronger evidence; by giving us A MORE SURE WORD OF PROPHECY."

—But the *general* subject of the EPISTLE will further support the truth of this Paraphrase.

—It is a farewel address to the CHURCHES, on his having received intimation, from the *holy Spirit*, of his approaching Martyrdom.

* See Mr. M.

The Apostle begins with repeating to them [from ver. 3d to the 15th] that elegant summary of Christian Religion,* as was his wont, on all occasions, to inculcate. But, at this juncture, CONSOLATION being what the afflicted Church most needed, he takes his topic from the REWARDS, now supposed to be approaching, at the *second coming of our Lord* in the consummation of all things. PERSECUTION had soothed the sufferers into this flattering error, which was now become general, and not likely to be soon redressed, while they continued unable (as they yet were) to distinguish the *two parts* of which this PREDICTION, concerning the *second coming* of our Lord, was composed. Each part had its distinct completion, commencing at different periods. The *first*, when our Lord came to judgment, on the JEWISH PEOPLE, in putting a complete period to their ŒCONOMY, by the destruction of their TEMPLE; The *other*, when he was to pass judgment on the whole race of mankind, and make a final end of the MUNDANE SYSTEM.

Or rather, to speak with more exactness, this prediction of the SECOND COMING was delivered in *two Prophecies* joined together; and, in imitation of the Jewish mode, mixed and interwoven with one another; generally as little understood, at the time of the delivery, as all those of a like import were, which had either a *secondary sense*, or included a *double subject*. But for a larger account of these, and particularly of the sort now in question, I beg leave to refer the Reader to the *sixth Section of the sixth Book* of this Work.

Such was the *Error*, which (as we say) gave birth to the *consolatory Epistle* here explained. But as all ERRORS, together with the accidental *good*, which, by the directing hand of Providence, they are made to produce, are easily attended with much evil; so it was here.

At first, the *Error* produced sobriety, vigilance, and perseverance in the FAITH. But afterwards, it had a contrary effect. *There shall come in the last days* (says this Apostle) *scoffers, working after their own lusts, and saying,* WHERE IS THE PROMISE OF HIS COMING? *For since the Fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.*†

After the censure of this Impiety, the Apostle proceeds to upbraid their ignorance of the natural constitution of the Earth; which is physically ordained to bring on its own destruction, by FIRE, in some future period; as heretofore, by the destruction of WATER: and that the *delay* of this dreadful Catastrophe, which affords these scoffs of Impiety, is not owing to the Lord's *slackness* in the performance of his *promise; but to his long-suffering; that all might come to repentance.*‡ He then describes this final dissolution of all things, by *fire.*§ Out of which (he tells them) shall arise (according to the promise of

* See the Sermon on this text. † 2 Peter iii. 3, et seq. ‡ Verse 9.
§ Verses 10—12.

PROPHECY) *a new heaven and a new earth, wherein shall dwell righteousness.** And with this the FAREWEL EPISTLE concludes.

Such being the subject of it, who can doubt but that a true account of the reasoning in the latter part of the *first* chapter is here given? and, consequently, that the Apostle's purpose is not to speak of indefinite *Prophecies already fulfilled* IN, or UNDER, the OLD TESTAMENT, but of some precise Prophecy *to be fulfilled* under the NEW; in order as the several parts of it (extending through a course of many Ages) should come into existence.

TO THIS the Church of Christ is bid TO TAKE HEED, as to *a more sure word of prophecy*. But had the description ended here, it would have been much too vague to enjoin our attention in so earnest and particular a manner. The Apostle, therefore, goes on to give it this characteristic Mark—that it was A LIGHT SHINING IN A DARK PLACE. A *Prophecy*, of which the principal parts were, at that time, surrounded and partly involved in obscurity and darkness; but yet, emitting so many scattered Rays, as to make a careful observer inclined to think some great scene was just beginning to open, which would amply reward our attention to *this light shining in a dark place*, by the change of its condition, first into a *dawn*; and then, into still clearer *day-spring*.

The Apostle having thus prepared our way to this SURER WORD, or superior excellence of PROPHECY, proceeds to acquaint us with the very IDENTICAL PROPHECY he had in his eye; which will now appear to be no other than the predictions of St. *Paul* and St. *John* concerning ANTI-CHRIST, or the future fortunes of the *Church*, under the usurpation of the MAN OF SIN; a prediction elegantly called, by way of eminence, THE WORD OF PROPHECY. For this *Man of Sin* began to *work* before the writing of this farewel Epistle. So St. Paul assures us—THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY (says he) DOTH ALREADY WORK.† St. Peter, therefore, towards the conclusion of his Epistle, recurring again, as his subject required, to God's long-suffering, in the delay of his *second coming* to judge the world, adds, *even as our beloved* PAUL *also, according to the* WISDOM *given unto him, hath written unto you: as also in all his Epistles*, SPEAKING IN THEM OF THESE THINGS IN WHICH ARE SOME THINGS HARD TO BE UNDERSTOOD, *which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction.*‡ Now what are these OBSCURE PARTS in St. Paul's Epistles, here characterised, but the *Prophecies* in St. John's Book of the REVELATIONS concerning ANTICHRIST,§ abridged by St. *Paul* in his Epistles, and referred to by St. *Peter*.‖.....

* 2 Peter iii. 13. † 2 Thess. ii. 7. ‡ 2 Peter iii. 15, 16. § See SIR ISAAC NEWTON'S "Observations upon the Apocalypse of St. John," chap. i. ‖ See the remainder of this argument in Discourse *On the Rise of Antichrist*.—R. W.

[As bishop Hurd, in the preceding note, signed R. W., has referred the reader, for "the remainder of the argument," to the "Discourse on the Rise of Antichrist," and that portion of bishop Warburton's Works not being generally accessible to students, it has been deemed desirable in this place to append that part of it which has not been already introduced, as a suitable conclusion to the ninth book.]

THE RISE OF ANTICHRIST.

Now this Book of the *Revelations*, containing Predictions darkly and enigmatically delivered, hath yet such strong marks of the Divinity about it, as may well justify St. Peter's character concerning it, of *a light shining in a dark place;* while his direction *to take heed* to it, and to contemplate the subject-matter of it, bespeaks his charitable attention to the pastoral care. For several of the Prophecies having already had their completion, even in those early times, frequent attention to this *light* was useful, to confirm their Faith in the past, and to support their Hopes in the future.

The principal subject of this famous Book relating to one great Event—*The future fortunes of the Church, under the usurpation of* THE MAN OF SIN, is elegantly called, by way of eminence, the WORD OF PROPHECY. It began fulfilling even before Peter wrote his Epistle; for St. Paul, speaking of the MAN OF SIN, to the Thessalonians, says, *the Mystery of iniquity doth already work.** It is therefore, with the greatest truth as well as strength of Colouring, called A LIGHT SHINING IN A DARK PLACE. Just so much was seen of the busy *mystery of iniquity*, now beginning to work, as was sufficient to fix men's attention, and to put them on their guard against its delusions.

The Apostle too, for the further encouragement of those whom he exhorts to give early attention to this ray of *light*, adds, that a time would come when the surrounding *darkness* should be dispersed, and *Day* pour in upon the present obscurities in this WORD OF PROPHECY: on which, in the mean time, they were patiently to wait—UNTIL THE DAY DAWN, AND THE DAY-STAR SHOULD ARISE. This long wish'd-for *Day* at length appeared, with REFORMATION on its wings: A Blessing, which redeemed Reason and Religion from the harpy-claws of Monkish Ignorance and Superstition.—The restoration of abused Science, which accompanied it, is well described by the *Day dawning;* as the defecation of polluted Religion is by the *Day-star rising in their hearts.*

At this important Æra, the great *Mystery of Iniquity* was clearly revealed; *Antichrist* was fully laid open and exposed; and such Evidence given by *Prophecy* to the truth of the Christian Faith, as must, while Reason remains amongst men, strike conviction on the *hearts* of the unprejudiced. For what but the Spirit of God was

* Second epistle, ii. 7.

sufficient to foretell the Usurpation of an Antichristian Tyranny, which was to arise many ages after, within the Church of Christ itself; a species of blasphemous Dominion, which the world had never seen before, and of which, not the least conception could be formed either from example, similitude, or analogy. But the Apostle foreseeing that when this flood of *light* should break in upon a long-benighted world, the imagination would be, now, as apt to extravagate, as before, when it was bewildered amidst the surrounding darkness, He thought proper to add this important caution—*Knowing this first, that no Prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation;* i. e. "When you sit down to study the Apocalypse, let it ever be under the guidance of this great Truth, That it is not in the department of man to interpret unfulfilled Prophecies, by pretending to fix the natures and seasons of Events, clearly indeed predicted, but obscurely described. For that the Interpreter of Prophecy is not Man, but God; who, by bringing events to pass, affords to Man the only true interpretation."

That this is the meaning of the Apostle's words, so long wrested to absurd and licentious purposes, is evident from the reason he assigns of his caution—*for the Prophecy came not in the old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost:* i. e. "for Prophecy, under the old Law, was not the effect of human conceit, but of divine influence." Therefore both the *prediction*, and the *interpretation*, which is the *accomplishment* of the prediction, are equally the word and work of God, and become manifest in the course of his Providence.—Nor did the Prophets themselves always understand the full or even the true import of what they delivered, being only the Organs of the Holy Spirit. Much less then can we suppose the common Ministers of the word to be qualified for the office of Interpreters of unfulfilled Prophecies. How necessary it was to give this caution, appears from what he himself observes in this very Epistle, of certain *unlearned* and *unstable* men, who *wrested those hard places* in St. Paul, where the *man of sin* is mentioned, to their own destruction.*

This dangerous ABUSE, which began so early, and lasted so long, hath infected every age of the Church; especially these LATTER TIMES; when the wonderful accomplishment of several of the Prophecies concerning *Antichrist*, having set Divines upon a more accurate study of the *Apocalypse*, the men of warmer imaginations, forgetting this apostolic caution, instead of confining their contemplations to the Prophecies already fulfilled, for the support of their Faith, and the consolation of their Hopes, have erected themselves into PROPHETS; and, taking the work out of the hands of Provi-

* Chap. iii. 3, 4.

dence, have dared to predict of what is yet in the womb of Time, and still remains in a dark place.

But how extravagant soever some Protestant Interpreters have been, when they gave a loose to their Imaginations, yet the soberest of them have universally concurred with the wildest, that this *man of sin*, this *Antichrist*, could be no other than the Man who fills the PAPAL CHAIR: Whose usurpation in Christ's Kingdom, and Tyranny over Conscience, by *intoxicating the Kings of the earth with the cup of his enchantments*, and Himself, *with the blood of the saints*, so eminently distinguishes Him from all other unjust Powers, that the various Churches who broke loose from his *Enchantments*, agreed in supporting the vindication of their Liberty, on this common Principle, that the POPE or CHURCH OF ROME WAS THE VERY ANTICHRIST FORETOLD.

On this was the REFORMATION begun and carried on: On this, was the great SEPARATION from the Church of Rome conceived and perfected: For, though *Persecution for Opinion* would acquit those of schism, whom the Church of Rome had driven from her Communion; yet, on the principle that She is *Antichrist*, they had not only a right, but lay under the obligation of a command, *to come out of this spiritual Babylon*.*

On this Principle (the common ground, as we say, of Reformation) the several Protestant Churches, how different soever in their various models, were all erected: though, in course of time, some of the less stable have slipped beside their foundation, and now stand aslant from the common building. For as the zeal of the Reformed kept abating, the Principle came to be deserted; and at length laughed at as the fancy of brain-sick visionaries.

Therefore, before we proceed to the vindication of this important Truth, it may be proper to inquire into the chief causes of so general a Desertion—I mean, as it is now seen amongst ourselves.

II.

The first occasion of discredit began very early. Some of the first Reformers, even in the days of ELIZABETH, suffered themselves to entertain scruples concerning the further use of whatever, in the *Roman Ritual*, had been abused to superstition. These scruples were fostered by the Mosaic Law, ill understood: in which, whatever had been abused to Idolatry, was (as they conceived) condemned and desecrated. Now the force of this analogy (such as it had) arose from the Principle, that THE POPE WAS ANTICHRIST, and the CHURCH OF ROME THE SPIRITUAL BABYLON: from whence the *People of Christ* being commanded to come out, as the *People of God*

* Rev. xviii. 4.

had been, from Egypt, it seemed congruous to reason that PAPAL and EGYPTIAN Rites were equally abhorred by the God of purity.

I will not stay at present, as it is a matter foreign to the subject, to discriminate the natures of the TWO DISPENSATIONS, by which the folly of applying the Laws of One to the administration of the Other, might be made apparent.

It is more to the purpose to observe, that these scrupulous men (from thenceforth called PURITANS) by their obstinacy, which ended in a *Separation*, soon grew very troublesome, and even formidable to Government. And ANTICHRIST, and the WHORE OF BABYLON, being now become the watchword, as well on account of its being the general ground of *Reformation*, as because they deemed it the particular support of their *Puritanism;* it is not at all strange, that what, till now, had been a *common Principle*, should, from henceforth, be considered by the Established Church, in no other light than the *support* of separation, and the *badge* of separatists. But, as a *support*, those who were most attached to the national worship would be forward to bring the Principle into discredit; and as the *badge*, they would be ashamed to have it appear upon themselves.

The reign of JAMES the First gave another and more decisive stroke to the unfashionable doctrine of *Antichrist*. He abhorred the PURITANS, against whom Elizabeth was contented to be only on her guard; and he feared the PAPISTS, whom Elizabeth set at defiance; so that to countenance the doctrine of *Antichrist*, was, in his opinion, to give credit to the Puritan, whom he hated, and to make the Papists desperate, whom he feared. The Court-Divines, therefore, sought his favour, by speaking slightly of the doctrine; or by treating it with contempt. And the greatest Divine* and Scholar of that age ruined his fortune at Court by an immortal work in defence of this *common Principle*. Nor does James's writing a *Paraphrase on the Revelations*, before he was twenty, to prove the *Pope* to be *Antichrist*, or the cutting some lively jokes on the old Gentleman in his more advanced age, at all shew that his sentiments were different from those I have here given to him; for the *Paraphrase* was apparently the composition of his Puritan Governors; and as for his Jokes, he would at any time sacrifice a *Friend* to their good reception.

But there was another cause of still more weight, which, at this time, concurred to discredit the *doctrine of Antichrist:* and that was the effects of the persecutions which the Puritans, at that time, underwent. For, religious Persecution hardens and contracts the Will, and inflates and inflames the Imagination; so that the Puritans, supported under their oppression, by *stubbornness* and *enthusiasm*, soon began to fancy that they saw the evils they suffered foretold in

* MEDE.

their favourite Prophecies concerning *Antichrist:* which set them upon interpreting the *Apocalypse*, not so much to illustrate, by the aid of critical learning, what was past, as to teach, with the air and spirit of Prophets, what was to come: regardless of the sage information of the Apostle, that the unfulfilled Prophecies *are not of private interpretation*. It will be easily believed, what wild work this spirit must produce in minds thus agitated, when brooding over so mysterious a Book: In which, amongst their other visionary discoveries, they saw all that concerned their own cause and sufferings, together with the happy issue of them, in the glorious triumphs of the Saints: And it will be as easily conceived, what dishonour these extravagances must bring upon the great PRINCIPLE itself. The Court and Comic Poets, who are generally the Pensioners or Creatures of the Great, soon took up the subject; and having it at this advantage, turned these Prophecies and their Interpreters, into mockery and ridicule. From thence, the People catched the infection; and *Antichrist* and *Fanaticism* have been ever since synonymous terms.

LAUD (who was bred up in College with an aversion to the Puritans) when under CHARLES THE FIRST he soon became all powerful, encouraged the more rational principles of the *Arminians;* of which sect GROTIUS and EPISCOPIUS were the two main Pillars. Now the moderation of the One, and a visionary scheme of the Other, indisposed both from pressing Popery with the victorious doctrine of *Antichrist*. This, which added fresh discredit to it, encouraged one Court-Divine* (afterwards an Archbishop) in an Act at Oxford, to deny publicly, that the *Pope was Antichrist;* while another of the same fashionable party, though much more able and discreet,† ventured, in pure aversion to Fanaticism, to adopt the System of GROTIUS on this head; a System, to which Popery has been much indebted; and which GROTIUS seems to have invented for the sake only of his darling Project, an Union between the Catholic and Protestant Churches.

The Civil Wars, and the overthrow of the Constitution, soon followed, the glorious atchievement of a rabble of armed Fanatics! whose Enthusiasm was inflamed to its height, by their second project, to destroy *Antichrist*, and erect *the fifth Monarchy of* King *Jesus*. Indeed, these were no other than the various spawn of the first persecuted *Puritans*. So that when Monarchy was restored, and Churchmen of greatest merit were, by a rare chance, become most in repute at Court, the severity of their sufferings in the late confusions, and their aversion to the fanatic spirit that occasioned those sufferings, enough disposed them to follow the example of the old Court Clergy,

* SHELDON. † HAMMOND.

in discountenancing a Doctrine whose abuse had so much contributed to aggravate the preceding mischiefs.

The licentious practices and the Popish projects of the Favorites and Ministers of CHARLES THE SECOND further concurred to bring this GREAT PROTESTANT PRINCIPLE into discredit: Amongst these, whatever concerned the sublimities of Religion, and the mysterious ways of Providence; whatever disgraced the Church of Rome, or stigmatized her with the brand of ANTICHRIST, was sure to be treated with contempt and aversion.

The REVOLUTION, indeed, removed many of these prejudices; and, by the vindication of *religious* as well as *civil* Liberty, abated the rancour of Sects and Parties against one another. Nay, by the recent terror and abhorrence of Popery, from which men were but just recovered, it even produced contrary prejudices, favourable to the cause of truth. So that now one would have hoped, this capital *Prophecy* might at length have procured a fair and equitable hearing. But, alas! the remedy came too late: The distemper was grown inveterate, and ANTICHRIST and BABYLON were still held to be the language of cant and enthusiasm. So that no eminence of genius, no depth of Science, could secure the Writers on *this Prophecy* from contempt. Of this we have lately had a portentous instance, respecting the most sublime mind* that ever was; and in whose amazing efforts this nation most justly prides itself: who was no sooner known to have commented on the REVELATIONS, than he was judged† to have fallen into dotage. And this great Expositor, as great when he laid open the mysteries of the *Religious* System, as when he unveiled those of the *Natural*, was almost generally condemned to neglect and oblivion.

III.

Notwithstanding all these disadvantages, under which the man must labour who comes to the defence of this SURE WORD OF PROPHECY, yet a full sense of the importance of the case will be sufficient to encourage a Protestant Divine to make the attempt: For, on the Prophecy concerning *Antichrist* the Protestant Churches were founded; and by the APOCALYPSE in general are they impregnably upheld.

The contempt, in which the Doctrine now lies, hath kept in credit the miserable shifts the Church of Rome hath employed to cure the *deadly wound* which cannot be *healed*. For as that Community hold the *Apocalypse* to be Canonical, they are obliged to own, that the object of the Prophecy is *Antichrist*, or the *Man of sin*; and, what is more, that it is in ROME itself where he domineers. For, the place

* NEWTON. † By Voltaire and the French Philosophers; a sect sprung from our Freethinkers.

of his residence, the City on the *seven hills*, is so plainly marked out, that it can be neither mistaken nor denied.

This is hard upon them, as it lays them under the necessity of going back as high as the first PERSECUTING EMPERORS, that is, to the first Ages of the Church, to seek for this *Man of sin;* and in the circumstances of the rage and impiety of those Tyrants, and in the state of the then suffering Church, to find out all that relates to the *Antichristian Power* foretold.

The difference of opinion, therefore, between the Romish and Protestant Churches, on this important point, stands thus:—The *Romanists* hold that this ANTICHRISTIAN POWER is a power of the CIVIL kind; the Reformed contend that it is a power ECCLESIASTICAL. While both concur to fix the *seat* of this Power, whose nature is thus disputed, in the CITY OF ROME.

This long Contest may therefore be well reduced to a single question, a question which leads to a decisive issue,—"IS THIS ANTICHRISTIAN POWER OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL, OR IS IT OF THE CIVIL KIND?"—If it be a *civil power*, the Church of Rome gains her cause, and clears herself of the capital charge of the *Man of sin's* sitting in the chair of PETER, and usurping in the *Kingdom of Christ*. If the *power be ecclesiastical*, the Protestant Churches triumph, as being established on *Prophecy*, and having their secession and separation justified* by the command of the Holy Spirit.

To determine this decisive question, we shall have no occasion to lanch out into that wide ocean of Literature, agitated by a thousand storms, arising from every controversial quarter of this unexplored world of MYSTICAL PROPHECY. For, if the Power foretold be of the *civil* kind, it can relate only to the persecuting EMPERORS; if it be a Power *ecclesiastic*, it can relate only to persecuting POPES. For it is agreed on all hands, that PERSECUTION is the BADGE OF ANTICHRIST.

But before I proceed more directly to shew that the *Pope*, and not the *Emperor*, is interested in the actions and fortunes of this MAN OF SIN, it will give additional force to the Evidence, if we reflect, previously, on the distress to which, both matters of *fact* and matters of *right* have reduced the Advocates of the Papal Cause.

To evade the edge of these Prophecies, which cut so deep into the vitals of the Church of Rome, her Advocates did not want dexterity, when they interpreted *Antichrist* to be a Power of the *civil* kind. This took the burthen from off their shoulders, by removing the whole Scene into an opposite quarter; a quarter fertile of plausible applications. Their dexterity consisted in turning necessity into a shew of choice. For the birth of *Antichrist*, his acts and atchievements, being

* Rev. xviii. 4.

confined to one particular City; in order to find a *Civil Power* domineering in this City, and persecuting the Church of Christ, they were obliged to force their way upwards, to the first Ages of Christianity. But, how much this makes their Cause to labour, we shall now endeavour to evince.

1. First then, had *Antichrist* or the *man of sin* been the persecuting Roman Emperors, the Christians of that time must needs have seen and acknowledged his Character, in the working and the accomplishment of the Prophecy: They, who were Contemporaries, and, of course, perfectly well acquainted with every circumstance respecting the *Persecutors*, and every circumstance attending the *Persecution*, could not but see how all of them (if such were the fact) quadrated with every part of the *Prediction;* and so have been fully convinced, that the *Man of sin* was the *Emperor of the world;* as indeed he was not likely to be one in a much lower Station. On the contrary, though PERSECUTION *be the family-badge of Antichrist*, yet the Christians of that time saw nothing in the *imperial edicts*, or in their execution, that had any marked resemblance to the desolations to be committed by the *man of sin*. They saw nothing there even to excite their attention, or to erect their minds towards the Crimes or towards the Punishment of the *man of sin*, so graphically described by the apostles Paul and John: nor, indeed, any other circumstance in their then state of oppression, sufficient to rescue the *Apocalypse* from a total neglect, save in the doubts they entertained of its authenticity. So that, if the *Prophecy of Antichrist* concerned the *early* fortunes of the Christian Church, as our Adversaries pretend; and that, yet, the Church, most concerned, saw nothing of it, as was the case; Unbelievers will say, that no greater disgrace can befal PROPHECY than what these two things, when laid together, will occasion.

2. Again, it is to be observed, that the Information concerning *Antichrist*, or the *Man of sin*, was not intrusted to St. John alone. It was communicated to other of the Apostles; perhaps to all, for reasons we may easily collect; certainly, to the *great Apostle of the Gentiles*. Now St. Paul, in his second Epistle to the Thessalonians, combating a growing error then risen in the Church, "that the SECOND COMING of our Lord was at hand," says, *Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there be a falling away first, and that* MAN OF SIN *be* FIRST *revealed, the son of Perdition.** This is no obscure intimation that the reign of ANTICHRIST was at some considerable distance. But the words which follow put the matter out of doubt: *Remember ye not* (says he) *that when I was with you, I told you these things? and now ye know,* WHAT WITHHOLDETH *that* HE *might be revealed in his time. For the*

* Chap. ii. 3.

MYSTERY OF INIQUITY *doth already work: only* HE, *who now letteth, will lett, until he be taken out of the way: and then shall that* WICKED ONE *be revealed.**

By this, it appears, that the impediment, or *lett*, to the revelation of *Antichrist* was something *external*.—That spirit of Pride, persecution, and impiety, which makes up the Character of the MAN OF SIN, was already breeding and fostering in the Church; and were it not for an impediment *without*, which would take some time to remove, his appearance might have been soon expected. This impediment, we see, St. Paul scruples to lay open by Letter; at the same time, he reminds them, that, in his Conversations with them, he had explained the secret. But surely, when his argument led him to it, he had small cause to decline a repetition, unless he thought it dangerous to be put in writing. Such a reserve was not his wont. On other occasions of precept and instruction, he inculcated what he would impress upon their minds, by frequent remonstrances and repetitions, *in season and out of season*. We must conclude, therefore, that something of great importance occasioned his reserve. And if this *lett* to the appearance of *Antichrist* were the present EXISTENCE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE, we are not to wonder he should scruple to commit so dangerous a secret to paper; He who, on all occasions, was so cautious not to give offence to the *civil Power*. And what would have been deemed so high a crime of State against IMMORTAL ROME, as to teach that her Dominion was to pass away; and, as an obstruction to the eternal Decrees of Providence, to give place to a Power still more tyrannical and unjust?

Now, as the *Papal usurpation* arose out of the Ruins of the *Roman Empire*, and could have arisen, naturally, by no other means, we have great reason to believe, that the EXISTENCE of this EMPIRE was the very *lett* and impediment so obscurely intimated by the prudent Apostle.

However, he tells us, that the secret had been communicated to the Churches. And probably it was one amongst the chief of those dangerous informations, which, we learn from the history of the Primitive Church, were kept, with all care, from the knowledge of the Catechumens.

What then would such a communication to the Church produce, but what it did produce, a general Opinion, that the appearance of *Antichrist* was to be in the *latter times?* The Apostle, we find, when he combated the common error, that our Lord's *second coming* was at hand, employs this general opinion concerning *Antichrist*, to shew how much they were mistaken, by an argument to this purpose, "You acknowledge that *Antichrist* is to appear in the *latter times*;

* Verses 5—8.

now this *Man of sin* must be revealed before the *second coming;* consequently the *second coming* must needs be far off."

The *late appearance of Antichrist* was a doctrine so universally received in the primitive Church, that it was like a proverbial saying amongst them; and from thence St. John takes occasion to MORALIZE on the Doctrine, and warn his followers against that spirit which, in after-times, was to animate the *Man of sin.*—"Little children," says he, "it is the *last time:* and ye have heard that *Antichrist* shall come: even now there are many *Antichrists;* whereby ye know that it is the *last time.*"* As much as to say, We are fallen into the very dregs of time, as appears from that *Antichristian* spirit which now so much pollutes the Churches: for you know, it is a common saying, that "*Antichrist is to come in those wretched days.*" The Apostle goes on to employ the same allusion through the rest of the Epistle—*He is* ANTICHRIST *that denieth the Father and the Son.*†—Again—*This is that spirit of* ANTICHRIST, *whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.*"‡—And again—*Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a Deceiver and* AN ANTICHRIST.§ Where, we see, the Appellation, *Antichrist,* is employed to signify *an enemy of God and godliness in general,* by the same figure of speech that *Elias* was designed in those times to signify a Prophet; and *Rachel,* a Daughter of Israel; and that, in these times, *Judas* is used for a Traitor, and *Nero* for a Tyrant. But as these converted terms necessarily suppose, that they originally belonged to persons of the like Characters, who had them in *proper;* so does the name *Antichrist,* transferred by St. John, to certain of his impious Contemporaries, as necessarily suppose, that there was one who should arise in the latter times, to whom the *title* eminently belonged, as marked out in the Prophecies by the *proper name* of ANTICHRIST.

This was not amiss to observe, because the Advocates of the See of Rome have laid hold of these passages to shew, that ANTICHRIST was only a *generic term* for every enemy of God and godliness: Whereas we Protestants insist, that it was the *Proper name* of one Grand Impostor; not *one* by the individuality of *Person,* but by the identity of *Station,* to be revealed in the latter Ages of the Church; and, after he had been foretold by name, that was applied *generically,* by the commonest figure of speech, to all who had any semblance to his Character. The only difference is, that Prophecy enabled the sacred Writers to use the generic appellation, before the appearance of him who had it for his patronymic; whereas, in the other cases,

* 1 John ii. 18. † Verse 22. ‡ Chap. iv. 3. § 2 John 7.

the generic term must needs come after the Person who first bore it for his own name.

From these places therefore of St. Paul and St. John it necessarily follows, that the ANTICHRIST or MAN OF SIN predicted by Both of them (his *Person* and *Fortunes*, more fully by the latter; his *Merchandize* and *Traffic*, more minutely by the former) could not be the persecuting Emperors.

Another very persuasive argument, that the Antichristian Power in question is the growth of these latter times, is the mysterious darkness in which the enigmatic prophecies in the Apocalypse concerning ANTICHRIST lay involved for many ages. *A light* indeed *shining in a dark place*, to the few sagacious observers of every age, but surrounded with so thick a darkness to all besides, that, despairing to penetrate the gloom, they consigned the *Apocalypse* to a general neglect, not without much uncertainty and doubt concerning its Author. But these *latter times* have seen the clouds and darkness gradually fly off, and the *light* grow stronger and brighter as the fate of ANTICHRIST approaches. This seems to be a sure evidence, that the grand Impostor is of these times; that he has advanced through several stages of his Usurpation; that two or three ages ago his power was at the height; that he is now past his meridian, and hasting to his decline; and that some future Age, not very remote, will see his total destruction; and consequently the remaining obscurity of this famous book made manifest to all.*

* A late Protestant Editor and Commentator of the NEW TESTAMENT, in reverence perhaps to the memory of Grotius, one of the brightest Ornaments of the Church or Sect to which this Editor belongs, contends, as that great Man had done before him, that the CHURCH OF ROME IS NOT ANTICHRIST. We know what it was that induced Grotius to maintain that system; it was a project of a comprehension long since out of credit, from a sense of its visionary impracticable nature: what it was that induced this learned man to revive it, a doctrine so injurious to the Protestant Cause, unless a mistaken fondness for that excellent Person's Memory, I confess myself utterly at a loss to conceive.

However, he assures us, that the fanciful application of *Antichrist* to the *Church of Rome*, was first made in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, by the FRANCISCAN MONKS: from whom he says the *Reformed Churches* received it: and then adds—*But the thing will hardly find credit with men of sense, that in a barbarous and unlearned age, the true key to the Apocalypse should be intrusted to these paltry Monks, destitute of letters and all knowledge of Antiquity, and denied to the whole Christian Church before, for Thirteen whole Centuries together.** No white-washer of Popery could have done better.

In a HISTORY OF THINGS PAST, and recorded in the *learned languages*, the languages of the times, the best Scholar and most sagacious Critic without doubt bids fairest for the best Interpreter: and the *earlier* he is to the subject, the better chance he has of being in the right.

But in a PROPHECY OF THINGS TO COME, foretold in all its circumstances, common sense assures us, that he is most likely to interpret best who lives *latest*, and comes nearest to the time of the *completion*. For he who hath seen one part already fulfilled, a part which gives light to the remainder yet unfulfilled, will certainly be best able to judge of the whole, and best understand to what object it capitally relates.

* Ægrè tamen apud cordatos fidem inveniet, seculo barbaro et indocto veram Apocalypseos clavem, per integra tredecim secula omnibus Christianis occultatam, a Monachis omni linguarum et antiquitatum cognitione destitutis, repertam fuisse.—*Nov. Test. Græc.* Amst. 1752. tom. ii. pp. 891, 892.

A third Objection to this papal interpretation, may be drawn from a Principle laid down in the entrance on this Discourse, viz. That *Miracles* and *Prophecies* are the two great Pillars of *revealed Religion;* but raised in succession, each in its proper time and place. From whence it may be collected, that the ACCOMPLISHMENT OF PROPHECIES belongs to the *latter times*, just as the WORKING OF MIRACLES does to the *former:* The use of *Prophecies fulfilled* being to strengthen the evidence of our Faith, from *Miracles performed;* which a long intermission of many ages may seem to have impaired. To suppose, therefore, that the accomplishment of these *Prophecies* happened, and is to be sought for, in the *first ages* of the Church, tends to cross and defeat the gracious purpose of the Founder; while it takes away *Prophecy* from these *latter times*, in

The most exalted genius, with the exactest knowledge of Antiquity, and skill in Languages, could not enable the *early Fathers of the Church* to form any tolerable judgment of a thing at that time almost totally hidden in futurity; especially if it were (as was the case here) in a matter of which the mind of man, for want of the knowledge or experience of any thing similar, could have no conception.

On the other hand, the profoundest ignorance, in the want of all those accomplishments, could not hinder the most stupid *Monk* from seeing what was before his eyes, *Antichrist in Pontificals*, and the *Man of Sin arrived at his full stature*. This extraordinary Personage he might know, by the mere information of his sense, was the bloody tyrant foretold.

On other occasions indeed, for wise and general purposes, it pleased Divine Providence to *hide* the great mysteries of the Gospel *from the wise and prudent, and to reveal them unto Babes*. But in this, the same dispensation was necessary and unavoidable: And the FRANCISCANS, without a miracle, had the honour of starting ANTICHRIST in his form, which, without a miracle, the *Origens* and the *Chrysostoms* must hunt after in vain.

But the pleasantest part of the argument is behind.—*If* (says the learned Critic) *we believe the Franciscans when they tell us, that the Pope is the Beast and the whore of Babylon, we must of* NECESSITY *believe them, when they tell us, that they themselves are the only spiritual Brethren, the true Church, and that the single mark of the true Church is to live on alms, and to wear a strait and short capuchine.** Commend me to a Reasoner like this; a Reasoner on *necessity*. What! because that which the *Franciscans* saw before their eyes, and we see with ours, and so agree with them, that the Prophecy of Paul and John concerning ANTICHRIST was fulfilled in the POPE, therefore we must of *necessity* believe these same Monks when they say they are the true Church, though no Prophecy hath given us the marks either of them or their pretended church, unless it be in the *Frogs* that *came out of the mouth of the* BEAST.—If you give a man credit for what he can prove, we are obliged, it seems, to give him credit for what he cannot.

The Commentators of the present age, as living so much later than those *Franciscans*, have seen more marks of the Beast, as he grew more enraged; for then, as the poet said of his fellow-beast the *Tiger*,

—he swell'd with angry pride,
And call'd forth all his spots on every side—

and so have been able to give the most convincing proofs that he is the Inhabitant of the *Seven Hills;* and in this the Protestant World has generally acquiesced. But does the sober part of it believe, that therefore the warm-headed Interpreters of the *Apocalypse* have discovered (as they pretend) the MARTYRS, SAINTS, and WITNESSES, persecuted and despoiled by the SCARLET WHORE and her infernal Abettors, in their own Friends and Parties in Religion? By no means. And why? These Interpreters prove, in the most incontestible manner, that the CHURCH OF ROME IS ANTICHRIST; but we see they only fancy they have discovered the Objects of his rage, in those who do honour to their Cause.

* Qui vero Franciscanis credit, Pontificem Romanum esse belluam et meretricem Babylonicam, iisdem etiam credat NECESSE EST solos fratres spirituales esse veram ecclesiam, et unicum veræ ecclesiæ characterem esse vivere pane mendicato, et gestare arctum brevemque cucullum. P. 892.

which it is wanted, and gives it to the former, which stood in no need of it; bestowing on some Ages a wasteful abundance, and depriving others of a necessary supply.

Thus, on the confession of our Adversaries, the head-quarters of ANTICHRIST being fixed in *Rome;* and, on the conviction of our senses, his tyrannical and usurped Power being exercised in these *latter times:* We come more directly to the main question, WHETHER ANTICHRIST BE A CIVIL POWER, OR A SPIRITUAL?

That it was a SPIRITUAL, we shall now evince, by the following reasons:

1. In these *latter times,* there hath been no Civil power in ROME, separate from an Ecclesiastical; but an Ecclesiastical only, which hath drawn after it, a Civil. So that if ROME were the seat of ANTICHRIST, and these *latter times* gave rise to his Usurpation; and that, in these *latter times,* there was no such civil power in ROME, but this of Antichrist; the consequence will be, that ANTICHRIST as such is a SPIRITUAL or Ecclesiastical, and not a CIVIL power.

The thing which hath kept this controversy on a creditable footing, is the TWO POWERS' changing hands as it were, and invading one another's provinces.

So that when we urge the Papists with *Antichrist's* having the marks of a *spiritual power,* and therefore, not the *Imperial;* they reply, these marks may well be seen in a Power confessedly Civil, since the *Emperor,* like the *Pope,* was always *Pontifex Maximus* here; and very often, a God, or a Saint at least, hereafter.

When, on the other hand, they urge us with those marks of Antichrist which bespeak him a *civil power;* we reply, that though the *Pope's* essential power be indeed of the *spiritual* kind, yet he rightly wears these marks of a *secular;* since such a power he had annexed to his spiritual, (just as the Emperor annexed a spiritual power to the civil) by his investing himself with a civil Dominion, called *St. Peter's Patrimony.*

2. So far in confutation of the System framed by Grotius, to facilitate the project of a visionary Comprehension; a system of real service to nothing but the Papal Tyranny. It is true, that the evidence here employed is only negative; yet it comes with a force, which no *positive* evidence can exceed. But to leave no subterfuge for doubt, I shall close all with the other species, the proof *positive,* taken from the Apocalyptic Character of this famous Personage.

3. POWER is male or female indifferently. Hence, the *Power* in question is sometimes said to be the attribute of the MAN OF SIN; sometimes, of the SCARLET WHORE. A corrupt Church may be found either under a popular or monarchic government. Under a popular,

One name and one personage would serve in enigmatic Prophecy, both for the Governor and the Governed; because they are all reciprocally one and the other: and such a Church might be commodiously represented by *one* single Personage. But, under a *monarchic* or despotic Government, the *Acts and Monuments* of such a Church cannot be well represented but under *Two;* the Tyrannic Head and miserable Members, sometimes suffering under, and sometimes, again, sharing in, the Tyranny.

On this account, there was a propriety and elegance in the occasional change of the Sex, by the sacred Penmen. The POPE, as Usurper and Tyrant in *Christ's Kingdom*, is represented under the *male image* of ANTICHRIST or the MAN OF SIN; and the CHURCH OF ROME, whose cup of abominations had debauched and intoxicated the world, under the *female image* of the SCARLET WHORE.

And as this affords us the clearest proof, that the Antichristian Power in question is of the SPIRITUAL and not of the civil kind, I shall pursue the Vision in those famous Prophecies which presents the Christian Church under a female form; first, in its celestial, native, purity; and then, in its degenerate and apostate state. For, of all the emblematic Pictures in the Apocalyptic Visions, those two are the least ambiguous.

In the xiith Chapter, a WOMAN comes from *Heaven*, "clothed with the Sun, and the Moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars: And she being with child, cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered—And behold a great RED DRAGON, having *seven heads and ten horns*, and SEVEN CROWNS upon his heads.—And the Dragon stood before the Woman, which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born. And she brought forth a man-child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of Iron; and the Child was caught up unto God, and to his throne. And the Woman fled into the WILDERNESS, where she had a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there."—

In the xviiith Chapter, an Angel says to John, "Come hither, I will shew unto thee the judgment of the GREAT WHORE, that sitteth upon many Waters: with whom the Kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the Inhabiters of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication. So he carried me away in the spirit into the WILDERNESS: and I saw a WOMAN sit upon a SCARLET-COLOURED BEAST full of names of blasphemy, having *seven heads and ten horns*. And the WOMAN was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones, and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations and filthiness of fornication. And upon her forehead was a name written, *Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots*, and abominations of the

earth. And I saw the WOMAN drunken with the blood of the Saints, and with the blood of the Martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration. And the Angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou marvel? I will tell thee the Mystery of the WOMAN, and of the Beast that carrieth her, which hath the *seven heads and ten horns.*—And here is the mind which hath Wisdom, the seven heads are *seven mountains* on which the WOMAN sitteth.—These shall make war with the Lamb; and the Lamb shall overcome them."

Though the two prophetic Visions, I have here transcribed, be full of evidence concerning the fortunes of ANTICHRIST, and the fate of the SCARLET WHORE; and that the POPE and See of ROME are no other than the *alias* names of the Criminal; yet our point being only to shew, that the ANTICHRISTIAN POWER in question is a SPIRITUAL and not a *civil* Power, I have at present nothing to do with its various ABOMINATIONS, here sketched out, further than as some circumstances, concerning these *abominations*, speak more fully to the general truth we are upon.

The SAME WOMAN, who represents the Christian Religion, we see appear in both the Prophetic Visions;—pure and immaculate when first let down from *Heaven;* but defiled and contaminated by a long commerce in the *Wilderness* of this world.

In her Virgin-state we see her armed in the celestial panoply of FAITH and KNOWLEDGE; and, (while in this state) like her almighty Father, *without variableness, or shadow of changing:* expressed by her being *cloathed with the sun, crowned with twelve stars, and the moon under her feet.*—She is in labour with her first-born, and *pained to be delivered;* by which is admirably held out, the dangers and difficulties our holy Religion struggled with, in giving birth to the infant Church, whom the Powers of this world stood ready to devour: strongly expressed by *the great red dragon who stood before the woman ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born.* Whose purpose was defeated by the *extraordinary Providence* of Heaven, wakeful for its preservation: *and her child,* whose future fortune, we are told, was *to rule all nations* (when he had degenerated into a Tyrant) *with a rod of iron,* as soon *as brought forth, was caught up unto God, and to his throne.*

The WOMAN fled into the WILDERNESS, and was in safety there. I know no better reason for our being informed of this circumstance, than that, when the *fortunes of the Church* are resumed, as they are in the xviith Chapter, we might know where to find her; and, as she was so totally changed, to know her likewise when we had found her. In this Chapter, therefore, the Prophet is led into the WILDERNESS, and introduced to her presence, *sitting upon a scarlet-coloured Beast,*

under the title of *the* GREAT WHORE, and branded in the forehead, as was the wont, in stigmatizing common Prostitutes. Indeed her meretricious dress and equipage sufficiently shew how much she was *fallen from her first love.* She is stript of all the ornaments which she brought down with her from Heaven; and instead of being *clothed,* as at first she was, *with the sun, and crowned with twelve stars,* she is now arrayed in *purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls:* that is, Religion had now exchanged those divine gifts and graces, with which she was first adorned by the Holy Spirit, for worldly wealth and grandeur, to which she was arrived, by coming to a good understanding with her old enemy the *Red Dragon,* or CIVIL POWER: Of whom having received the trappings of Sovereignty, she soon after tore from him the Sovereignty itself. A revolution in her fortunes well expressed by her MOUNTING and RIDING the SCARLET-COLOURED BEAST, the same with the RED DRAGON; as appears from the like number of *heads* and *horns* bestowed upon the Monster under each denomination. Nay, to mark this identity the stronger, the CROWNS which were on the *seven heads* of the *red Dragon,* while he was Sovereign, and a Persecutor of the Virgin, are no longer found on the *seven heads* of the *scarlet-coloured Beast,* now deprived of Sovereignty, and become subject to the *Scarlet Whore:* Who having got the *Beast,* or degenerated *Civil Power,* at this advantage, rides him at her pleasure; and, like another Circe, gives him of her *Golden Cup, full of the Wine of her abominations, and filthiness of* FORNICATION, while she herself drinks *the* BLOOD *of the Saints.—The Kings of the earth* (says the Prophet) *commit fornication with the Whore:* i. e. in this impure mixture of the two Powers, *civil* and *spiritual,* both become polluted; the *Civil* uses Religion for an engine of State, to support TYRANNY; and the *Spiritual* gets invested with the rights of the Magistrate, to enable her to PERSECUTE.

But if we attend to the Prophetic Language of St. John, we shall see more clearly the beauty of this representation. His language abounds in a mixed *phraseology,* formed on the different natures of the two Dispensations: And expressive of ideas belonging, sometimes to the one, sometimes to the other system. Each of these sorts the Prophet employs occasionally, as each best contributes to the force and elegance of his discourse. So here, *the Cup of fornication* alludes to the degeneracy of the Jewish; in which, the figurative name, for IDOLATRY, was *Fornication* and *Adultery.—The blood of the Saints* alludes to the distressed condition of the Christian; and more plainly signifies PERSECUTION *for Opinion.* These are the two great Reproaches of all Religion, natural and revealed: and each was the peculiar Pest, the one of Judaism, the other of Christianity. For

IDOLATRY violates the very essence of the LAW, and PERSECUTION defeats all the virtue of the Gospel. These two infernal Tyrannies, the Prophet represents as the Assessors of the SCARLET WHORE, now become Sovereign of the Earth.

But if we want to know the ingredients of this inchanted Cup, with which *the Inhabiters of the earth have been made drunk*, St. Paul will tell us. In his account of the *side-board* of the GREAT WHORE, he tells us, that "In the latter times some shall depart from the Faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and Doctrines of Devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received." * In which words the Holy Spirit graphically describes,—*the Worship of Saints—the fabrication of false Miracles—the invention of Purgatory, and the means contrived for escaping it—monkish and clerical Celibacy—Pagan fasts —and Jewish distinction of meats.*

The last excess of the *Woman in purple and scarlet colour*, after having intoxicated all others, is the getting drunk, herself—*I saw the Woman* (says the Prophet) *drunken with the blood of the Saints, and with the blood of the Martyrs of Jesus.*—In *lies* and *hypocrisy* the *Whore* began her reign; and in PERSECUTION, she filled up the measure of her Tyranny. Nothing now remained, but the coming vengeance of Heaven, when the TEN HORNS, or the Civil Powers of Europe confederated, *shall hate the Whore, and make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire.*† But this being an unfulfilled Prophecy, a matter yet in the womb of Time, we make no further use of it, than just, by quoting it, to cultivate and encourage a disposition in the RULERS OF THE EARTH, to facilitate the great work which Providence hath ordained to bring to pass by their ministry.

To conclude, I presume I have now performed what I undertook, (and it is all that is necessary for the support of the Protestant cause) viz. to prove, that ANTICHRIST and the SCARLET WHORE are a SPIRITUAL Power; and therefore, no other than the POPE and CHURCH OF ROME.

One of the soberest as well as soundest Reasoners of this reasoning Age, who, free from the enthusiasm of party-zeal, carried with him to the study of Scripture all the Philosophic light and precision, which he had learnt of his Masters, LOCKE and NEWTON (who themselves employed the richest of their stores in the like sacred service) after having paid the closest attention to the predictions of the *Apocalypse*, hath, as the result of all, been bold enough to put the truth of REVEALED RELIGION itself on the reality of that prophetic Spirit which

* 1 Tim. iv. 1, et seq. † Rev. xvii. 16.

here foretells the desolation of CHRIST'S CHURCH AND KINGDOM by *Antichrist;* and the restoration of both to their original PURITY and POWER. "If," (says he) "IN THE DAYS *of St. Paul and St. John,* there was any footstep of such a sort of power as this in the world; or if there HAD BEEN any such power in the world; or if there WAS THEN any appearance of probability, that could make it enter into the heart of man to imagine that there EVER COULD BE any such kind of power in the world, much less in the *Temple* or *Church of God;* and if there be not NOW such a power actually and conspicuously exercised in the world; and if any picture of this power, DRAWN AFTER THE EVENT, can now describe it more plainly and exactly than it was originally described in the words of the Prophecy; then may it, with some degree of plausibleness, be suggested, that the Prophecies are nothing more than enthusiastic Imaginations." *

* "Evidence of natural and revealed Religion," by DR. S. CLARKE, Rector of St. James's, Westminster, p. 282.

NOTES

ON

THE NINTH BOOK.

P. 344. A. On this Point it will be sufficient to refer the reader to those two excellent Writers, Dr. Samuel Clarke and Mr. W. Baxter, for a full Demonstration of the *immateriality* of that Substance, in which the faculties of sense and reflexion reside. [See Clarke's Tracts against Dodwell and Collins, and Baxter on the Nature of the Soul.] These Writers have gone much further than Locke and others on the same Subject; who contented themselves with shewing *the possibility, nay, great probability, that the thinking substance in us is immaterial.* [See Locke's Second Reply to the Bishop of Worcester, p. 600. of his Works.] But Clarke and Baxter have clearly proved, from the *discovered* qualities of a thinking Being, that the Soul cannot possibly be *material*, whatever *undiscovered* qualities it may be possessed of. And this conclusion was made (in my opinion) neither rashly nor at random. For, to unsettle our assurance in the truth of their Opinion, their Adversaries must shew that such *undiscovered* qualities are contrary to the qualities *discovered;* yet contrary qualities can never subsist together in the same substance, without one destroying the other. Hence, we understand the futility of Mr. Locke's *superinduction of the faculty of thinking to a system of Matter;* conceived, by that excellent Writer, in the modest fear of circumscribing Omnipotence; but Omnipotence is not circumscribed by denying its power of making qualities, destructive of one another, to reside in the same substance (for a power which produces nothing is no exercise of power); but by denying his power to change, together with consistent qualities, the *nature* of the substance in which those qualities reside. This power (supposing Mr. Locke contended for no more) will be readily granted; but his argument will gain nothing by it. On the contrary, by changing *materiality* into *immateriality*, it ends the dispute with the Bishop; but to Mr. Locke's disadvantage, by proving, that the Soul, or thinking Substance in us, is *immaterial.*

P. 352. B. The impious notion of the human Soul's being part or portion of the Divine Substance, made the *Theistical* Philosophers give no credit to the Doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments. [See the Divine Legation, Vol. II. B. 3. Sec. 4.] To avoid this impiety, certain Christian Enthusiasts taught that *eternity* was the condition of the Soul by *nature* as well as by *grace.* And so, before they were aware, fell into the very error of the Philosophers, which they were so anxious to avoid. For *eternity* being confessed by all to be one of the attributes of the Deity, it followed, that the human soul was indeed part or portion of the Divine Substance. This execrable frenzy, of which Religion could never get entirely free, (known by the name of Spinozism) hath of late appeared under its ugliest form in the Writings of Mr. W. Law, collected from the exploded ravings of Jacob Behmen. [See a book, intituled, An Appeal to all who doubt or disbelieve the Truths of the Gospel.]—But when learned

men wake out of one delirium, it is not to recover their senses, but to fall back again into another; and that, generally, is its opposite. So it was here. The Philosophic Converts to the Christian Faith, in the first ages of the Church, were no sooner convinced of the folly of fancying that *the human Soul was a Part of the Godhead*, than, in their haste to be at distance from that monstrous opinion, they ran suddenly into a contrary folly, and maintained, that the Soul had not one spark of the Divinity in her whole composition; but was MATERIAL as well as *mortal:* now degrading man to a brute, whom before they had exalted to a God. Nor hath this extravagance been destitute of (for what extravagance hath ever wanted) the patronage of modern Divines. We have seen it lately employed in support of a fresh whimsy, viz. THE SLEEP OF THE SOUL. One thing however seems to be defective in the Scheme; which is, the not rectifying the old error of a RESURRECTION. For, I apprehend, that when a MATERIAL Soul is once gone to Sleep, nothing but a RE-CREATION can awake it.

P. 358. C. Other *death* had been understood, viz. *Eternal life in misery*. But, to see what ill use hath been made of this portentous comment, we need only attend to *Collins* in *his discourse of free-thinking*. "We learn in the *Old Testament*," (says he) "that Adam by eating the forbidden fruit subjected himself and all his Posterity to death. But the *New Testament* TEACHES US TO UNDERSTAND, *by death, eternal life in misery;* and from thence, we know that GOD HAD BUT ONE WAY to put mankind in a capacity of enjoying immortal happiness." p. 153. Having given, in this buffoon manner, so absurd and monstrous a picture of REDEMPTION, (to the composition of which the School Divines had greatly contributed) he, and his free-thinking colleagues, hoped that their Doctrine of *Christianity's being only a republication of the Religion of Nature* would go down the easier. And they well enough understood how to manage that unscriptural error to their advantage; as may be seen by Tindal's book, intituled, Christianity as old as the Creation; which combats the Christian Revelation, under cover of the absurd concessions of certain latitudinarian Divines of a later date. These concessions, Tindal miscalls the PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIANITY. Hence this formidable book became one continued thread of contemptible sophistry from beginning to end. Yet I remember the time when the false terror of it alarmed the whole body of the Clergy, for the *danger* of the Church, who were but just recovered from the *Sacheverel-crisis*.

P. 358. D. The REMONSTRANTS, fearing that this interpretation of the text might give countenance to the School-doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN, deny that *Infants* are here meant, by *those who had not sinned*, &c. But the fear is vain. It was *death*, and not *damnation, which reigned from Adam to Moses*. The expression—Καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας, &c.—implies it was a part only of the human species which was *free from sinning after the similitude of Adam's transgression;* or *the being without sin*. And what part could this be but the infantine?

P. 366. E. It is true, that notwithstanding the conformity of this language in the *Revelations* to that of Peter and to the Gospel of John, some Critics, and particularly Grotius, would have the text in the *Apocalypse*, which says,—*all that dwell upon the Earth shall worship him whose names are not written in the Book of Life, of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world*—to be thus understood—*The Book of Life written from the foundation of the World*—and not as here translated—*Christ slain from the foundation of the World*. However, both the one and the other sense infers the same truth; for if *the Book of Life* [of the Lamb slain] *was written*

from the foundation of the world, it is plain, that the *Lamb slain*, or the *sacrifice* of his death, *was pre-ordained from the foundation of the World.*

P. 369. F. The reason why Jesus, at the first publication of the Gospel, refers so little to the FALL, which concerned all mankind, and so much to his MESSIAHSHIP, which directly concerned only the Jews, is apparent; his Mission was first directed to the *house of Israel.* He left his Apostles to carry on their Ministry of the Gospel to the *Gentiles.* Hence St. Paul, who was more eminently *the Apostle of the Gentiles*, is so explicite in his account of the RESTORATION FROM THE FALL. This furnished a handle to Lord Bolingbroke to affirm, with equal ignorance and malice, that—*Paul preached a* NEW GOSPEL, *different from that of Jesus.*

P. 379. G. A learned and serious Writer,* in a late book, intituled, Observations and Enquiries relating to the various parts of ancient History,† hath a chapter concerning HUMAN SACRIFICES; which he thus introduces—*One would think it scarce possible that so unnatural a custom as that of* HUMAN SACRIFICES *should have existed in the world. But it is certain, that it did not only exist, but almost universally prevail.*‡ Our account of the origin of this *unnatural custom* will much abate the wonder. However, the learned Writer solves the difficulty with much ease; by deriving it from the *Command to Abraham.* And here, before I enter on the matter, permit me to repeat, what I have before observed, that it indicates an odd turn of mind (however general it may be), which disposes the Learned to seek for the origin of the superstitious Rites of antiquity, rather in the casual adventures of particular men, than in the uniform workings of our common nature.§

But the learned Writer fancies his solution is much strengthened by the general notion of Antiquity, that the ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΘΥΣΙΑ was a *Mystical Sacrifice.* Let us examine his reasoning on this head. Mr. Bryant having given us, from the fragment of Sanchoniatho, what relates to IL or KRONUS's sacrifice of his only Son (by which, indeed, it appears, that *human Sacrifice* was not a conceit of yesterday; the Author of that fragment plainly deriving his story from this part of the Abrahamic History), goes on in these words, "They" [human sacrifices] "were instituted probably in consequence of a *prophetic Tradition*, which I imagine had been preserved in the family of *Esau;* and transmitted, through his posterity, to the people of Canaan."‖

To this, let me, first of all, observe, that the supposition of a *prophetic tradition* rests entirely on the truth of *my peculiar idea* of the *nature of the command to Abraham*, viz. That it was a *mere scenical representation, given at the patriarch's earnest request.* For on this idea only could the *command* be considered as a *prophecy.* But this is doing too much honour to my hypothesis, still held, I suppose, by the more orthodox, to be a paradox; and, what is still worse, it greatly weakens the learned Writer's reasoning; for a *scenical representation*, which must naturally end as this did, in a prohibition of the commanded sacrifice, could hardly induce any one, who went upon the grounds, or in consequence of a *prophetic Tradition*, to think that *human Sacrifices* were acceptable to the Deity. But the truth is, *this prophetic Tradition*, in the family of Abraham, is merely *gratis dictum.* We find not the least footsteps of it in the more circumstantial History of the other branch of Abraham's Family, the Patriarchal; which was most concerned to preserve it, had there been any such. Besides, how this *commanded Sacrifice*, which was forbidden to be perpetrated, should encourage human sacrifices, before men had steeled themselves, by long

* MR. BRYANT. "the Divine Legation." † Printed in quarto, 1767. ‡ Page 267. § See ‖ Page 291.

use, in the practice of so unnatural a crime, is hard to conceive. It is true, that this argument will lose somewhat of its force, when we suppose the *command* was given to a family which were no strangers to *human Sacrifices*. This is observed purely in reverence to truth; but, be this as it will, it subverts the fancy of the *Abrahamic original*. For the fact seems to be, that, at the time this *Command* was given to the Patriarch, the Gentile world was deeply plunged into this diabolic Barathrum: which though the descendants of Esau possibly had not escaped, yet the line of Isaac certainly had.

The Mosaic account of the State of Religion in the Abrahamic times, shews that it was extremely depraved. For though the iniquity of the *Amorites was not yet full*,* yet that of their neighbours, in Sodom and Gomorrah, we know, was. These considerations reasonably induced *Philo the Jew*, in his *Discourse concerning Abraham*, to suppose that *human Sacrifices* were in use before the time of Abraham. And Marsham, one of the best modern Critics concerning ancient times, declares, without hesitation, in favour of this humiliating circumstance; and our admirable Spencer thinks, there is so little reason to ascribe the original of *Infanticide* to the *command to Abraham*, that, unless the History of that command be told very lamely and imperfectly, it affords very strong arguments against that inhuman practice. But it is not generally the way of Scripture to reprobate a bad practice before it has been conceived or committed.† Hence we may fairly collect, that *human Sacrifices* were in use before the *command to Abraham*. But what need we more to prove the fact in question, than this, That, if the account, here given, of the origin and progress of *Sacrifice* be the true, (as it hath the fairest claim of being so received, since the first use, and all the gradual abuses of it, till it sunk into the horrid Rite in question, may be understood, and understood only on this simple Principle, the uniform workings of our common nature) human Sacrifices must needs have preceded that æra.

What follows, in the learned Writer, as a strong confirmation of his system, is this, *that* CHILD-SACRIFICE was a type or representation of SOMETHING TO COME. Now, if by *Child-Sacrifice* he means the *command to Abraham*, this we allow and even contend for. But, if he means that the specific rite of Child-sacrifice was understood by Sacrificers, either Jewish or Gentile, to be a type or representation of SOMETHING TO COME, I think he speaks without the least proof.—What he adds, one knows not what to make of.—*Child-sacrifice* (says he) *is the only instance of any Sacrifice in the Gentile world which is said to be* MYSTICAL.—For if by *mystical* he means, *a type of something to come*, this has been answered already. But if by *mystical* we are to understand what was *so* called by the Gentiles in their Sacrificial Rites, almost all of them were *mystical;* that is, had a meaning subjoined, not obvious, nor intended to be obvious to the uninitiated, or the *Profane*. All their *secret Rites*, in which *Sacrifice* bore a principal part, abounded so much in hidden meanings of this sort, that these Rites were called MYSTERIES by way of eminence.

But if, after all, this ΤΕΚΝΟΘΥΣΙΑ or *Child-sacrifice* had the *plain* meaning which I have given to it, and not the *mystical* of the learned Writer, what becomes of his whole hypothesis?—That it had no other meaning,

* Gen. xv. 16. † "Probe novi quamplurimos alia omnia de ritus hujus nefarii fonte sentire, quasi ex Abrahami filium suum offerentis historia corrupta et depravata profluxissent. Huic autem sententiæ fidem adhibere nescio, cum historia illa, nisi planè mutilata, magna præbeat contra morem illum inhumanum argumenta; et verisimile sit multas Gentes liberos suos immolare solitas, de Abrahami exemplo, ne vel fando quicquam audivisse."—*De Leg. Hebræorum ritualibus*, lib. xi. cap. xiii. sect. 3.

than the plain one, I appeal to the Authority of an *inspired* Writer. MICAH, without doubt, understood the true Origin, and consequently, the right import of *Child-sacrifice;* and he delivers my sense of it in these words—*Will the Lord be pleased with ten thousands of Rams, or with ten thousands of Rivers of Oil?* SHALL I GIVE MY FIRST-BORN FOR MY TRANSGRESSION: THE FRUIT OF MY BODY FOR THE SIN OF MY SOUL?* Here, we see, conformably to what I have delivered concerning *Child-sacrifice*, that the idea the Gentiles had of it, (for, to the *Gentile*, not to the *Jewish* sacrifices, the Prophet here alludes, as will be shewn hereafter) was simply, and solely, this, *the very highest atonement that man could make for his transgressions*, as it was the offering up what was most dear to the offender. The Prophet, therefore, puts it in the number of *expiatory Sacrifices*. But had that, which the learned Writer contends for, been the true and ancient notion of the τεκνοθυσία, one can hardly think that, at a time when the Prophets were gradually opening the nature of the NEW DISPENSATION, *Micah* would have let slip so fair an occasion of considering it under that Christian idea.

We may now see, for what reason *Child-sacrifice* came to be reckoned a MYSTERIOUS WORSHIP; it was done, to withdraw the observation of the People from so horrid a rite, when considered only in its simple use; for nature is rarely so far debauched, as to behold, with indifference, the violation of its most instinctive appetites. So that the enormity was to be covered by some far-fetched invention of superior excellence of virtue, which preferred the rights of the Divinity to all human obligations. Thus, when the Worshippers were apt to revolt at *Sacrifices* extremely cruel or libidinous, the Priests secured their own credit, and the honour of their God, by the intervention of a *spiritual meaning*. And *human Sacrifices* became *mysterious* for the same reason that the impudent procession of the *Phallus*, in the corrupted Rites of Bacchus and Osiris, was taught to convey the high matters of REGENERATION, and a *new life*.

I have been the longer on this question, because, if human Sacrifices should be thought to have had their original from the *Command to Abraham*, it might seem to give some colour (which was far from the intention of this very learned and worthy man) to the calumny of the Deists, who assert, that HUMAN SACRIFICES MADE A PART OF THE MOSAIC RITUAL. For if the τεκνοθυσία prefigured the *Sacrifice on the Cross*, or, as the learned Writer expresseth it, *was a type or representation of something to come*, it softens a little this infidel Paradox. The *Poet* VOLTAIRE hath repeated the calumny over and over, as if the Bible was still shut up, not only from the people in general, but (what, perhaps, would have been attended with less injury to Religion) from THESE POETS in particular.

And now, this more serious question, (in the midst of one less important, viz. *the origin and progress of sacrifice in general*) will deserve a severe examination.

VOLTAIRE, in a thing he calls, "An Essay on general History," accuses the LAW, in these Words—"The Jewish Law seems to permit these [human] Sacrifices. It is said in Leviticus, that *none devoted which shall be devoted of men shall be redeemed, but shall surely be put to death.*† The Jewish Books bear evidence, that when the Israelites over-ran the little country of Canaan, they massacred, in most of the villages, men, women, and children, because they had been DEVOTED. On this Law it was that *Jephtha* sacrificed his daughter."‡

* Micah vi. 7. † Lev. xxvii. 29. ‡ "La Loi des Juifs semblait permettre ces Sacrifices. Il est dit dans Levitique; *si une ame vivante a été promise à* DIEU, *on*

1. This whole calumny I shall clear away, first of all, by the most express prohibitions of the LAW, together with the declarations of the PROPHETS; both of which execrate every species of *human Sacrifice.*

2. And then examine and explain all those passages of Scripture, which seem to have given a handle to this impious charge.

3. Concluding, in the third place, with a confutation of that censure of inhumanity towards the inhabitants of Canaan urged by Voltaire, to support his main accusation of HUMAN SACRIFICES, and urged as if it were itself in the number of such Sacrifices.

I.

In my entrance on the first head, let me previously observe, that the earliest direction for SANCTIFICATION, that is (in the language of Moses) for SACRIFICE, is of the *first-born*, expressed in these words,* SANCTIFY *unto me all the first-born, whatsoever openeth the womb amongst the Children of Israel, both of man and beast; it is* MINE. This is declared to be for a memorial of God's *smiting Egypt in favour of his chosen people.—All the first-born of the Children of Israel are* MINE, *both man and beast: on the day that I smote the first-born in the land of Egypt, I* SANCTIFIED *them for myself.*†

But from this *Sanctification* or SACRIFICE, *Man* and *unclean animals* were excepted, and *redeemed.* The *redemption* of the first-born of man is thus settled and explained—"I have taken" (says the text) "the LEVITES for all the FIRST-BORN of the Children of Israel: and I have given the *Levites* as a gift to *Aaron* and his Sons, *to do the service* of the children of Israel, in the tabernacle of the Congregation."‡ The *redemption* of the *first-born* of *unclean animals*, with a repetition of the redemption of Men, is thus expressed:—*Every firstling of an ass shalt thou redeem with a Lamb—and all the first-born of man, amongst thy Children shalt thou redeem.*§ The redemption-money, for both, is given to *Aaron* and his successors;‖ to whom the whole tribe of *Levi* was assigned for a vicarious (and in lieu of a more general) *sanctification* of the first-born of man.

This *redemption* was not on account of personal favour to a *chosen people*, but in abhorrence of HUMAN SACRIFICES, as appears plainly both from the LAW and the PROPHETS.

Moses, on his delivery of the LAW, thus solemnly forbids all curious enquiry concerning the Pagan rites of Worship, in the Nations round about them; *Inquire not after their* GODS, *saying, how did these nations* SERVE *their Gods?* EVEN SO WILL I DO LIKEWISE. The reason of the prohibition follows, they practised the horrid enormity of *Child-sacrifice—For every abomination to the Lord,* WHICH HE HATETH, *have they done unto their Gods;* FOR EVEN THEIR SONS AND THEIR DAUGHTERS HAVE THEY BURNT IN THE FIRE TO THEIR GODS.¶ The dangerous curiosity here restrained, was not on account of the number and nature of the Gods of Canaan. For the striking absurdity of their *Theogony* or original, and the impiety of their *Mythology* or history, would have served to attach the Israelites more firmly to the LAW. The prohibition only respected an inquiry into the Canaanitish *modes of worship*, or, as it is better expressed in the text,—HOW *these nations served their Gods.*

ne pourra la racheter, il faut qu'elle meure. Les Livres des Juifs reportent que quand ils envahirent le petit pais des Cananéens, ils massacrérent dans plusieurs villages, les hommes, les femmes, les enfans—parce qu'ils avoient été devoués. C'est sur cette Loi que furent fondés les serments de *Jephthé* qui sacrifia sa fille," &c.—*Oeuvres de M. de Voltaire*, tom. xiii. p. 227, eighth edition, 1756, 8vo.

* Exod. xiii. 2. † Num. viii. 17; Exod. xiii. 14, 15. ‡ Num. viii. 18, 19, and to the same purpose, iii. 12—45. § Exod. xiii. 13. ‖ Num. xviii. 15, 16. ¶ Deut. xii. 30, 31.

And though this inquiry might, at first, arise from nothing else than a wanton curiosity, yet the Legislator intimates that it would end in apostacy from the LORD OF HOSTS—*even so will we do likewise;* that is, we will use those Pagan rites in the service of the God of Israel; for they were little in danger, so early, to use Canaanitish rites in the service of the Gods of Canaan. Besides, the caution here is not against IDOLATRY but INFANTICIDE. Nor could they be much disposed to forsake the God of Israel for the Gods of Canaan, at the very time they were so successfully marching, under the auspices of Moses, to exterminate that devoted people. He therefore could scarce conceive that, at this time, they needed such a caution. For, the reason he gives for restraining this hurtful inquiry is, lest they should worship their own God with Pagan rites: especially this most abominable of all, INFANTICIDE. And there was the more need of this caution, since the *first-born of man and beast*, in Israel, were to be *sanctified to the Lord;* and though the first-born of man was redeemed, while the first-born of the *clean beasts* were sacrificed, yet the love of corrupt and idolatrous Rites might give some propensity to a fatal mistake, and to slip in *Sacrifice* instead of *sanctification*.

Afterwards, when the Israelites became polluted with the infernal stains of *Infanticide*, the PROPHETS never ceased to proclaim aloud God's abhorrence of this impiety. For, in order to impress upon the paganised or apostate Israelites a due sense of their frequent defections, it was found necessary for these his messengers thoroughly to probe the consciences of such hardened wretches, which had been seared with the *fires of Molech*.

Sacred History informs us, how severely *Ahaz* was punished for his multiplied Idolatries; but principally for his "burning his Children in the fire, after the abominations of the Heathen [the Canaanites] whom the Lord had cast out before the Children of Israel."*—*They sacrificed* (says the Psalmist) *their sons and their daughters unto Devils—the Idols of Canaan—and the Land was polluted with blood—insomuch that he abhorred his own inheritance* †—"They have built the high places of Baal" (says Jeremiah) "to burn their Sons with fire, for burnt-offerings to Baal."‡ And again—*they caused their Sons and their Daughters to pass through the fire, to Molech.*§ Ezekiel, likewise, accuseth them of having caused their *Sons to pass through the fire to* DEVOUR *them.*|| But further, it would seem, by the following words of Jeremiah, that these impious sacrifices were offered, by the unnatural Jews, to the God of Israel himself.—"The Children of Judah have done evil *in my sight*, saith the Lord; they have set their abominations *in the house which is called by my name*, to pollute it, and they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the Son of Hinnom, to burn their Sons and their Daughters in the fire, *which I commanded them not, neither came it into my head.*"¶ The concluding words seem to intimate that these Apostates pretended to have received such a command; or with what propriety was it so formally denied? Possibly they might pervert the famous passage in Leviticus;** of which more hereafter.—However, the whole of the text informs us clearly, that *Child-sacrifice* sometimes polluted the altars of the Temple. Ezekiel seems to confirm the same thing. "Moreover, this they have done unto me; they have *defiled my Sanctuary, in the same day, and have prophaned my Sabbaths.* For when they had *slain their Children unto their Idols*, then *they came, the same day, into my Sanctuary to prophane it, and lo! thus have they done in the midst of mine house.*"††—i. e. "When they had slain Children to their

* 2 Chron. xxviii. 3. † Psalm cvi. 38—40. ‡ Jer. xix. 5. § Jer. xxxii. 35. || Ezek. xxiii. 37. ¶ Jer. vii. 30, 31. ** Lev. xxvii. 28, 29. †† Ezek. xxiii. 38, 39.

Idols, they, on the same day, offered the like horrid sacrifice to me."—And we know, it was their usual practice, amidst their defections, to join *idol-worship*, to the worship of the God of Israel.

The sacred Historian is still more express to this purpose; when he thus speaks of the wicked king Manasseh—*He built altars in the house of the Lord—and he built altars for all the Host of Heaven, in the two Courts of the house of the Lord*, and HE MADE HIS SONS TO PASS THROUGH THE FIRE; *and observed times, and used enchantments*, &c.*

On the whole, the gross IMMORALITY of this horrid Rite, was that to which the abhorrence of God was principally, and often solely, directed. This truth would appear certain (did Scripture afford no other evidence) from the warning given by Moses to his People, on their going to take possession of the Promised Land.

But a decisive passage in Isaiah cuts off the subterfuge of our Philosophers, who are ready to suppose that the declared abhorrence of *human Sacrifices*, so often repeated in Scripture, is confined to such as were directed to an IDOLATROUS OBJECT; for the Prophet, in the very place referred to, speaking in the name of God, declares the utmost detestation of *human Sacrifices* when offered to himself: For, speaking to those immoral Israelites, who imagined they could atone for their vices by ritual observances, he tells them, that even *legal sacrifices*, when offered to him with corrupt dispositions, were as displeasing to him, as those abominable *human Sacrifices* would be, which the Law of Nature condemns.—*He that killeth an ox is as if he had slain a* MAN; *he that sacrificeth a lamb as if he cut off* A DOG'S NECK.† Here, we see the ritual worship, commanded by God, is opposed to the *Sacrifice of Man*, abominated by the Law of Nature; and to the Sacrifice of a Dog, the thing most abhorred by the Law of Moses; in whose ritual this animal was held so totally unclean, that *the hire of a whore*, and the *price of a Dog*, are put together, as equally unfit to be brought into *the house of the Lord*.‡

II.

We now come to those two capital Passages, on which the Enemies of Religion found their impious Charge. The one, they consider as an indispensable COMMAND; the other as an EXAMPLE, adapted to inforce the execution of it.

The pretended *Command* is in *Leviticus*, and contained in these words:—NONE DEVOTED, WHICH SHALL BE DEVOTED OF MEN, SHALL BE REDEEMED, BUT SHALL SURELY BE PUT TO DEATH.§

Here is a *Law*, which our Philosophers, in their great sagacity, conceived did enjoin something. But being strangers to the subject, and ignorant of the phraseology, with heads likewise full of mischief, they discovered HUMAN SACRIFICES in a place where Moses was speaking of quite another thing.

The Chapter, in which this *Law* is found, contains directions for the making, and for the performance of Vows; a mode of obligation which had a natural place in a government THEOCRATICAL; where *civil* matters of obedience were intimately connected with *religious*.

Now, that capital Command given to the Chosen People, TO EXTERMINATE THE CANAANITES, a command so necessary to be observed, for the preservation both of their *civil* and *religious* Systems, needed, above all things, frequent repetitions of the sacred tie of Vows for its more exact performance;

* 2 Kings xxi. 4—6. † Isai. lxvi. 30. ‡ Deut. xxiii. 18. § Lev. xxvii. 29.

some of the softer as well as stronger passions of our Nature, pushed forward by the delusions of self-interest, being always at hand to defeat or retard the divine sentence denounced against an INCORRIGIBLE People (of which more hereafter). The repetition of *Vows*, therefore, for the speedier accomplishment of this great and laborious event (just like the repetition of oaths of allegiance in common states for the better security of the establishment) was enjoined, or at least encouraged, by the Leaders of the Jewish people.

Sometimes the Vow was made by the People, in a Body; like that we find in the Book of *Numbers*—"And Israel vowed a *Vow* unto the Lord, and said, If thou wilt, indeed, deliver this people [the Canaanites] into my hand, then *I will utterly destroy their Cities*. And the Lord hearkened unto the *Voice* of Israel; and delivered up the Canaanites: and *they utterly destroyed them and their Cities*."* Sometimes again, the vow was made by Particulars; by such whose power or situation best qualified them for the execution of this primary COMMAND: and to these, and for this sole purpose, was this strangely mistaken Text directed. —"NONE DEVOTED, WHICH SHALL BE DEVOTED OF MEN," (or, as it is explained in the immediately preceding verse,—*no devoted thing, which a man shall devote unto the Lord*)—"shall be redeemed, but shall be surely put to death." † These *Vows* were called the SANCTIFYING or DEVOTING *men* or *things*. In which, indeed, the Language of Religion is employed; and very *naturally*, for the reason given above. But to prevent the abusive interpretation of such *Vows*, in the manner of our PHILOSOPHERS, by suffering more of *Religion* than the mere language to enter into the idea of them, the People are forbidden to extend their *vows* to what God himself had *sanctified*, such as the *first-fruits.—Only the firstling of the beasts, which* (says Moses) *should be the Lord's firstling, no man shall sanctify it.*‡ But if *man* was, for this reason, not to sanctify the first-fruits of *beasts*, much more was *he* restrained from sanctifying the first-fruits of *Man;* since the *first-fruits of Man* were not to be put to death (like those whom human Vows had devoted), but to be *redeemed.*

In a word, *the men here devoted by men, and not to be redeemed*, were NO SACRIFICES AT ALL, as the first-fruits of the Children of Israel WERE, and, therefore, to be *redeemed;* but enemies taken in battle, to whom no quarter had been given; and whose lives, by the Law of Arms, were at the disposal of the Conqueror. M. Voltaire's ignorance of the *Law of Moses*, which occasions him to mistake a MILITARY EXECUTION for a RELIGIOUS SACRIFICE, might have been well excused, had he forborne to abuse what he did not understand. But to know his Virgil no better is a disgrace indeed.

"Quis ILLAUDATI nescit Busiridis aras?"

says the great Poet, in plain detestation of *human Sacrifices*. Yet in the funeral Rites of *Pallas*, directed by the Hero of the Poem, (the Model of Religious Piety and civil wisdom) the captives taken in war are slain at the lighted Pile, without the least mark of the Poet's censure or disapprobation.

"Vinxerat, et post terga manus quos mitteret umbris
Inferias, cæso sparsuros sanguine flammam."

For their lives were forfeited by the Law of Arms, and only taken with a little more ceremony than is, at present, in use: the military execution being often performed at Tombs and Altars: for in the Pagan World,

* Num. xxi. 2, 3. † Lev. xxvii. 29. ‡ Verse 26.

Superstition had occasioned a confused mixture of things, sacred and prophane. But in the Jewish Republic, where the Church and State were incorporated, this commixture made no other confusion than what arises from the mistakes of Men, ignorant of the nature of that Sacred Oeconomy.—Their God was their *King;* and their government, in consequence, was *Theocratical.* So that every act of State was in a certain sense, though not in the common one, an act of Religion. Obedience to the LAW was inforced by a Vow; and slaughter in and after Battle, a DEVOTEMENT to the *Lord of Hosts;* in support of the civil command to exterminate the Canaanites.

But besides the singular Form of the Jewish Republic, which brought in the use of this language, the very genius of the People, modelled, indeed, on a *theocratic* administration, disposed them to improve that mode of speech; so that matters merely civil and domestic are conveyed to us in the style of Religion.

Thus highly coloured, both in the *Camp*, and in the *Temple* of the *Lord of Hosts*, was the language of the Jewish People. Which gave a pretence to the detestable Spinosa, to insinuate, that the whole of the Mosaic Religion consisted only in a SACRED PHRASEOLOGY. Though what he insinuates proves only, yet proves fully, that the DEVOTEMENT in question was a civil not a sacrificial *Rite.* "Judæi" (says he) "nunquam causarum mediarum sive particularium faciunt mentionem, nec eas curant, sed Religionis ac pietatis, sive ut vulgo dici solet, devotionis causa, ad Deum semper recurrunt. Si enim, ex. gr. pecuniam mercatura lucrati sunt, eam a Deo oblatam aiunt; si aliquid, ut fit, cupiunt, dicunt, Deum eorum cor disposuisse; si aliquid etiam cogitant, Deum id iis dixisse aiunt," &c.*

Having now examined the pretended PRECEPT or Command; and shewn that it has no relation to HUMAN SACRIFICE, but to quite another thing; we proceed to the EXAMPLE, the case of JEPHTHAH: for, *on the Law of human Sacrifices* (says the Poet Voltaire) *it was, that Jephthah, who sacrificed his Daughter, founded his oath of Devotement.*—As this EXAMPLE hath given more alarm to the Friends of Religion than it deserves, and drawn them into forced and unnatural constructions of his rash and foolish Vow, it may be proper to consider the Man and his Manners, fairly and at large.

JEPHTHAH,† a Bastard son of *Gilead*, by an Harlot, being cast out from a share of his Paternal Inheritance, by the legitimate Issue, took refuge in a strange land. What effects this expulsion must have on his religious Sentiments, we may learn from the case of DAVID; who thus expostulates with Saul, on his exile—"If" (says he) "they be your Counsellors, who have advised you to this unjust usage of me,—*cursed be they before the Lord; for they have driven me out this day from abiding in the inheritance of the Lord*, saying, GO, SERVE OTHER GODS." ‡ Now, if *David*, so learned and zealous in the LAW, was exposed at least to this inevitable temptation, by his exile in a foreign land, what must we think of *Jephthah* in similar circumstances? who had nothing of David's knowledge of the *Law*, and consequently none of his *zeal* for its support. In this foreign Land, *Jephthah* associated himself to a dissolute Band of Outlaws, who lived upon rapine and violence: not (it is confessed) the most discreditable profession, in those early ages of barbarous manners. Amongst these men, he soon got to be the leader, and

* *Tract. Theol.* cap. i. This was said by *Spinosa* in order to decry the MIRACLES recorded in *Scripture*. But with the usual luck of every attempt of the same kind. For were this very exaggerated account a true one, a stronger proof, of the reality and frequency of *Miracles*, could hardly be conceived in the nature of things. Since no People but such who had lived under a real THEOCRACY, could have contracted a turn of mind productive of so singular a *Phraseology*. † Judges xi. ‡ 1 Sam. xxvi. 19.

a distinguished Chief in all their lawless expeditions. So that his fame for military atchievements filled all the Regions round about.

At this time, the Israelites, in punishment for one of their defections from their God and King, were labouring under the oppression of the idolatrous Borderers. And the *Amorites* making an excursion into *Gilead;* the Israelites of this place, as most immediately concerned, sought to provide for themselves, as well as for their brethren (now become repentant), some Leader of superior power and distinguished capacity. And the Reputation of their Kinsman, *Jephthah*, made them first apply to him.

But Jephthah, with the frank roughness of a soldier of fortune, naturally upbraided them, on this occasion, with their former neglect and injustice, in permitting his father's house so cruelly to cast him out, to want and misery; and now, as meanly, without redressing his injuries, to fly to him in their distress.

They reply, they were now come to make him that amends, by their choice of him for *Head* over all the inhabitants of Gilead.

Jephthah accepts this satisfaction: and an *Act* is made of their proceedings, according to the religious customs of those times.

All this while, the *Republic*, the THEOCRACY itself, seems to have been little thought of, by this future *Judge of Israel.* Indeed the honour of so sacred a station had small charms for our licentious Outlaw.

However, in consequence of the reconciliation, and in pursuance of the Choice which the *Gileadites* had made of him, for their Head and Leader, he enters on his office. And now, perhaps, for the first time, he observed, towards his enemies, all the punctilios of the Law of Arms.

He sent to know of the Children of Ammon, why they committed hostilities against his countrymen. They answered, that the Israelites had unjustly dispossessed them of their Lands; and that they were now assembled in arms to recover the inheritance of their Fathers. To this, the *Bastard of Gilead*, like an able Advocate, as well as a determined Chieftain, replied, That when Israel, under the conduct of Moses, had left Egypt, to take possession of the Land, promised to their Forefathers, and now given to them by their GOD, they had craved leave of the intermediate People, and particularly of the *Children of Ammon*, for a free passage through their Country, according to the Law of Nations, which being denied unto them, they forced their way; and when hostilely opposed, and their enemies overcome in battle, they took possession, as, by the Laws of War, they might do, of the Lands of the Conquered. So far was well; and suitable to the dignity of a *Judge of Israel.*

But, by what follows, it appears, that our famous Adventurer was, as yet, more than half a Pagan; for thus he proceeds—*So now the Lord God of Israel hath dispossessed the Amorites from before his People Israel; and shouldest thou possess it?* WILT NOT THOU POSSESS THAT WHICH CHEMOSH, THY GOD, GIVETH THEE TO POSSESS? *So whomsoever the* LORD, OUR GOD, *shall drive out from before us, them will we possess.** This was said, on the Gentile principle of *local tutelary Deities*, in all the grossness of that notion; not yet refined and rationalized by our Adventurer, on the ideas of the Law. But when he resumes the *civil argument*, he again reasons better: and very solidly pleads the general law of PRESCRIPTION, in defence of his People.—*While Israel* (says he) *dwelt in Heshbon and her Towns, and in Aroer and her Towns, and in all the Cities that be along, by the Coasts of Arnon,* THREE HUNDRED YEARS; *Why therefore did ye not recover them* WITHIN THAT TIME?† But the force of this Argument making no impres-

* Judges xi. 23, 24. † Verse 26.

sion, the negotiation ended in an appeal to arms. *Jephthah* leads out his Troops against Ammon. And, in the Forefront, without doubt, were those faithful Bands, which he had collected and disciplined in the Land of *Tob*.

The first step he takes to invite Success, was the making an absurd Pagan Vow, that, if he returned with Victory, he would sacrifice, for a burnt-offering to God, whatsoever came first out of the doors of his house* to welcome his return. He came back a Conqueror; and his Daughter, impatient to celebrate his Triumph, being the first who met him, was, for his Oath's sake, (though with extreme regret, because, *besides her, he had neither son nor daughter*,†) sacrificed for her pains, according to the then established custom of *Idolatry;* which, on such occasions, required a Sacrifice of what was most dear or precious to the offerer. For, I hardly believe that *Jephthah* was, at this time, so learned in the LAW, as even the Poet Voltaire; or that he had proceeded, like him, so far in the sacred text, as to misunderstand or misinterpret this famous *twenty-seventh Chapter of Leviticus*, in support of so impious an action. The unhappy father appears, at this time, to understand so little of the LAW, as not to be able to distinguish what it had in common with Paganism, (namely the custom of offering eucharistical Sacrifices, on every great and fortunate event) from what it had in direct opposition to it (viz. that dire impiety of *human Sacrifice*).

The account here given appears to be the natural explanation of a plain Story. But Commentators, full of the ideas of *Papal*, rather than of the *Mosaic* times; and paying a blind reverence to the character of a *Judge of Israel*, make the Daughter, to save her father's honour, return *vow* for *vow;* and so consecrate herself to a Virgin State. Solutions like these expose Sacred Scripture to the scorn and derision of unbelievers.

But against our account of JEPHTHAH's VOW, which makes the whole to be conceived and perpetrated on Pagan principles and practices, our adversaries,

1. Bid us observe, that the action is not condemned. A censure, they think, it could not have escaped, had the Sacred Historian deemed it an impiety.

2. That the text tells us further, that *Jephthah went out in the Spirit of the Lord*,‡ and therefore they conclude, that he returned in the same *Spirit*.

3. Lastly, that Jephthah is extolled by the Author of *the Epistle to the Hebrews*,§ and numbered in the class of sacred Heroes.

To these objections, in their order.

First, They who lay so much stress on the Action's having passed uncensured, consider neither the nature of the Composition, nor the genius of the Historian. The narrative itself is a brief Compendium, or rather extract from the *Records of State*, entered as things passed, and then laid up in the Archives of their Scribes. In this species of Composition it is not the wont to dwell either on the causes, the qualities, or the consequences of Actions, but simply to tell the naked Facts.

Nor had the Writers of those times improved History into an art. They transcribed or abridged, merely for the sake of the people's information in facts, of what they found recorded in their venerable Archives. This was the case in the story of the *lying Prophet*, in the affair of the *Altar of Bethel*.|| His crime is neither condemned, nor is his punishment recorded. Had the *History* been a *Romance*, forged at pleasure, both these particulars had assuredly been dwelt upon at large.

Besides, as the nature and quality of actions are best seen by the *Laws*

* Judges xi. 31. † Verse 34. ‡ Verse 29. § Heb. xi. 32.
|| 1 Kings xiii.

and *Customs* of the people concerned; and the action in question was well understood, both by the Writer, and his Readers, to be condemned by the *Mosaic Ritual*, it less needed a Censure. The faithful Followers of the LAW, for whose service this adventure was recorded, wanted no historian of prophetic Authority to tell them, (after they had seen *human sacrifices* execrated in almost every page of their History) that *Jephthah's sacrifice of his Daughter* was either an impious imitation of Pagan practices, or an ignorant presumption in the half-paganized Votary, that he was here complying with the famous precept of the Law in Leviticus,* when indeed (as we have shewn at large) it related to quite another thing.

But further, it is not peculiar to this story, to furnish an objection (such as it is) from the sacred Writer's not interposing with his own judgment, concerning the *moral quality* of the action related. Scripture abounds with instances of this sort; a silence occasioned by one or other of the causes here explained.

2. But *Jephthah* (which is the second objection) *went out in the spirit of the Lord*, and therefore (they conclude) he must needs return *in the same spirit*.

Now though, on a less important occasion, I should be tempted to acquiesce in the *Criticism*, though not in the *spirit*, of Spinosa, that this expression was to be put to the account of the *sacred phraseology* of the Jews; and to mean no more than the strength, the courage, and the address of a consummate leader; yet the language being here applied to a *Judge of Israel*, and in the actual exercise of his office, I can readily allow that it signifies some *supernatural assistance*.

But what then? when the work committed to him, and for which he was thus qualified, was well over, we have no reason to suppose that the same spirit constantly rested on him, but very much to conclude the contrary. One of his most illustrious successors, SAMSON, had still a larger share of this *divine Spirit* imparted to him; yet nobody imagines that it rested with him; when, contrary to the LAW, he chose a wife from amongst the Philistines, or revealed the secret intrusted with him to Delilah; delinquencies much less criminal than the Sacrifice of a Daughter.

3. —But then, "the Author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* extols him; and lifts him into the number of the most distinguished of the Jewish Heroes."—But for what is he thus extolled?—For his rash *vow?* No surely. David is extolled in the same place, and in the same manner. Is it for the murder of Uriah, and adultery with his Wife? Surely neither of the Heroes are extolled for these exploits; but for their FAITH in God, and their zeal for the advancement of the THEOCRACY. So says the Writer himself; where, recapitulating the works and atchievements of FAITH, he goes on, in these words—*And what shall I more say, For the time would fail me to tell of Gideon and Barak, and of Samson and of* JEPHTHAH, *of David also and Samuel, &c.*†—This FAITH was so active and eminent in DAVID, that, notwithstanding his two gross immoralities, he is called by God himself, A MAN AFTER HIS OWN HEART. For, as this illustrious Title neither covered, nor atoned, for his crimes, so neither did his crimes hinder its being bestowed upon him, when the question only concerned his zeal for the LAW and the THEOCRACY; as I have shewn to these Philosophers, on another occasion.

To conclude with JEPHTHAH.—We know, though only in general, that he lived long enough in the exercise of his Ministry, and, consequently, under the occasional guidance of God's holy Spirit, to wipe out all the

* Lev. xxvii. 29. † Heb. xi. 32.

Pagan impressions of his ill education. DAVID, with a much better in his early youth, kept on improving in the knowledge of the LAW. He was at first somewhat scandalized at the *prosperity of the wicked:* but when he *came into the sanctuary*, i. e. when he had gained a more exact and perfect knowledge of the Dispensation, *then*, as he tells us, *he understood the end of those men.*—In these respects, indeed, we are left more to our conjectures concerning JEPHTHAH.—His History tells us, *he judged Israel for six years.** We are further informed (and this is all) that he defeated the Ephraimites ;† who had picked a groundless quarrel with him ; which ended as it is fit all such quarrels should end.

But, though we have now done with the personal Character of *Jephthah*, and his rash Vow ; we have something more to say of the general Character of a *Judge of Israel*, as it holds in common with that of many other of God's *chosen servants:* whose faults and imperfections the malice of Unbelievers have carefully drawn out, and objected to us, as matter of scandal ; tending to impeach the veracity of Sacred History, and the Evidence that God thus interposed in support of his revealed Will.

To clear up this matter, it may be sufficient to observe, that when God sees fit, in an extraordinary way, to give a new revelation of his WILL to man, we may conclude, from the very nature of things, that he will not disgrace his own DISPENSATION, by the use of unworthy Instruments.

Both the *dignity* and *interests* of Revelation require, that the *first Bearers* of these glad tidings to mankind should be fully possessed of that *power* of Virtue which true religion only can bestow.

The *dignity* of Revelation requires that so bright an emanation from the very source of light and purity should not be conveyed to us through a polluted medium. The *interests* of it, likewise, reclaim against such an unworthy Service.

A sanctity of manners, which is so necessary to support the mission, is the natural and inseparable attendant on the Office. For, in the promulgation of a new Religion, besides those marks of truth arising from the purity and reasonableness of the Doctrine, which shew it to be WORTHY of the Author to whom it is ascribed, there is need, in order to prove that it ACTUALLY CAME FROM HIM, of certain MIRACULOUS powers, declarative of the nature of the *Dispensation ;* and attendant on the sanctification of the heart of the Messenger.

But the *character* of God's Instruments, and the *conduct* of Providence in the use of them, may be very different from those who are only raised up, and employed for the *support* of an established *Dispensation ;* as in the Jewish œconomy ; or for the *reformation* of it, as in the Christian : though in the Jewish, administered by an extraordinary Providence, these Instruments may have had *extraordinary powers* intrusted to them, which those of the Christian had not. Here [*i. e.* for the support or reformation of things received and established] the same conclusion, for the necessity of sanctity of manners, will not hold. It being sufficient, for this purpose, that God, in the settled course of his Providence, is incessantly producing GOOD OUT OF EVIL. And the *irregular* Instrument is frequently made to serve, without his knowledge, and even against his will, the great ends of piety and truth.

Of the evidence of this, the History of the Church affords us many examples.

When God had gradually prepared, and, at length, fitted his *Chosen*

* Judges xii. 7. † Verse 1.

People for the reception of the LAW, his early Instruments were selected from the most virtuous amongst men, NOAH, ABRAHAM, and MOSES:

And, again, when he first prepared the World for the promulgation of the GOSPEL (which was the completion of the LAW) he committed the care of it to men of the most unblemished and exemplary characters; such as John the Baptist, and the blessed Apostles.

But in the *Establishment*, in the *Support*, and in the *Reformation* of Religion (the second and inferior Operation of Divine Love to Man) God did not disdain to employ less perfect Instruments, in either Dispensation. He served himself of DAVID for the LAW, and of CONSTANTINE for the GOSPEL. And under the former of these Dispensations, both before and after the period here referred to, when he had decreed, either to execute vengeance on the Oppressors of an offending People, or to clear the Holy Land of Idolaters, he frequently availed himself of the Agency of wicked Kings and licentious Rulers. The same gracious Providence was displayed in the preservation of Religion under the latter Dispensation. For, when the time was come that the Christian Church was to be cleansed and purified from the long pollutions of an Antichristian Usurpation, God was pleased to make use of Instruments, who had neither motives nor manners that could do honour to the *Reformation* they were appointed to bring to pass.

UNBELIEVERS did not sufficiently consider this, when they made it an objection to *revealed Religion;* nor PAPISTS, when they made the same objection to the *Protestant Reformation*. To the *First* we have already said enough on this head; and, to the other, shall only add at present, that we are far from being ashamed of receiving spiritual benefit from men, who supply these circumstances of reproach against themselves; while we find reason to adore that Hand which turned the avarice (if such was the case) of a furious Friar, and the luxury of a debauched Monarch, from their natural Mischiefs, to become productive of the greatest blessings; the Restoration of LETTERS and RELIGION.

But it is now time to go on with *M. Voltaire*, whose *Philosophy*, being grafted on his *Poetry*, produces Fruit worthy of the Stock it comes from, viz. *Fable* and *Fiction*. So that the next instance he produces of the encouragement which the LAW gives to *human sacrifices*, is Saul's *abortive vow*.—The wonder is, that he did not go on with the cases of Achan—the five Kings of the Amorites—Sisera—Agag—Adonijah—the five sons of Saul, hung up in Gibeah—and, in short, all the civil and military executions recorded in the Old Testament. But in his rage to run down Religion, he has out-shot himself, and forgot his subject.—To bring him to himself, I will, in charity, direct him to a text, which, if he knows how to pervert with proper dexterity, may appear more to his purpose than any of this senseless prate. It is in the Prophet *Micah:* who addressing himself to his corrupt and idolatrous Countrymen, amongst his other exprobrations, ridicules, and, at the same time, instructs them, in this manner,—"Wherewith shall I come before the Lord? and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with Calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of Rams, or ten thousands of rivers of Oil? SHALL I GIVE MY FIRST-BORN FOR MY TRANSGRESSION; THE FRUIT OF MY BODY FOR THE SIN OF MY SOUL? He hath shewed thee, O man! what is good. And what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" *

* Micah vi. 6—8.

Reasoners, like our poet, may fancy, that the Prophet is here reckoning up the most efficacious of the LEGAL SACRIFICES; and consequently, that INFANTICIDE and HOMICIDE are amongst the first of that number, since all are said to be offered up to *the Lord the high God.*

To confute this groundless fancy, let me previously repeat these two observations, First, that the Law of Moses is so far from requiring or directing *human sacrifices*, that it ever treats them with the utmost abhorrence; and therefore was very unlikely to speak of them as *legal Sacrifices:* secondly, it hath been shewn that the Idolatrous Jews of these times, were accustomed to bring into the TEMPLE-SERVICE the most detested Rites of Paganism.

This being premised, let us consider the season in which these Prophecies, sent to Micah, were delivered;—to whom they were addressed—and to what end, directed. They were sent, the prophet tells us, *in the days of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, Kings of Judah.**

We find by the History of these Kings, that, in their reign, the House of Judah was sunk into all kinds of vice and iniquity. But still the leading crime, through the bad example of these monarchs, was IDOLATRY; which consisted, sometimes in worshipping the God of Israel in the Pagan places of worship, called THE HIGH PLACES; at other times in worshipping Idols in the very place of God's worship, THE TEMPLE. Jotham, indeed, is said to have done *that which was right in the sight of the Lord. Howbeit that the* HIGH PLACES *were not removed; the People sacrificed and burnt incense still in the high places.*† But his son, Ahaz, we are told, "did not that which was right in the sight of the Lord his God, like David, his Father. But he walked in the way of the Kings of Israel. Yea, *and made his Sons to pass through the* FIRE, according to the abominations of the Heathen, whom the Lord cast out from before the Children of Israel."‡ Hezekiah supplied what was wanting in the Grandfather, and reformed what was amiss, during the wicked reign of his Father.

Amongst a people so corrupt, while any sense of Religion still remained, *Rites and Ceremonies* would always take the lead of *moral duties.* The Prophet seems to have availed himself of the good reign of Hezekiah: and to aid the reformation, which that Monarch had begun, attacks labouring Superstition in its head-quarters, amidst the fires of *Moloch.*

But to strike at the root of the evil, which was substituting *ritual* modes of Worship, in the place of *moral duties*, he informs them how unacceptable the external pomp and pageantry of Religion was to the God of Israel, when not accompanied with purity of heart, and integrity of manners. This is the general sense of the Text quoted above: which, without doubt, should be thus paraphrased—*Wherewith shall I come before the Lord* (says the Prophet, personating an idolatrous and immoral Jew), *shall I bring a profusion of Calves, and Rams, and Oil,* AS THE LAW DIRECTS; *Or if these be insufficient, or unacceptable to the Deity, shall I seek, as is now the practice, for a more powerful atonement,* AMONGST THE FOREIGN RITES OF OUR PAGAN NEIGHBOURS, *who boast of something still more precious and worthy the Altars of their Gods—*MY FIRST-BORN TO BE OFFERED UP IN SACRIFICE? *Vain man, subjoins the Prophet, do not God and Nature proclaim, that without* VIRTUE, *Rites and Ceremonies are of no avail, whether they be such as the* LAW *prescribes, or such as* IDOLATERS *(to whose practices thou art so enslaved) impiously fancy to be still more horridly efficacious.*

And how, *human Sacrifices* came to be so esteemed, we have shewn, in the course of this dissertation, *concerning the rise and progress of Sacrifice.*

* Micah i. 1. † 2 Kings xv. 34, 35. ‡ 2 Kings xvi. 2, 3.

III.

From the *Sacrifice of particular men*, charged by M. Voltaire, on the Jewish Law, he rises in his impiety to accuse it of the Sacrifice of a whole Nation. These are his words—"It is said in Leviticus that *none devoted* which *shall be devoted of men* shall be redeemed, but shall *surely be put to death*. The Jewish books bear evidence, that when the Israelites over-ran the little country of Canaan, they massacred, in most of the villages, men, women, and children—because they had been devoted."

In these words are included two charges against the Law.—1. That this *devoting* of the Canaanites was a *religious Sacrifice*. 2. Or, at least, a commanded extermination of a whole people, by the ministry of the Israelites. So that if one of them should fail, the other yet may hold.

I have already acquitted it of the first, by an explanation of the famous mistaken text in the xxviith chapter of Leviticus. We come now to the second, the censure of extreme cruelty and inhumanity in executing the command. And this will bring us to the concluding head, on this subject.—

The Moral Governor of the Universe administers his Sovereignty in two different ways: while moral Governors amongst men can, in their several departments, administer theirs only in one.

God, the Author of Nature, and Framer of its Constitution, hath so ordered and combined moral Entities, that Virtue generally, or for the most part, produceth happiness; while Misery is as generally attendant upon Vice. On this disposition of things, the rewards and punishments of free Agents are first of all adjusted. But this makes it neither superfluous nor inexpedient for the God of the Universe to punish and reward in another manner, likewise. Not *superfluous;* since this constitution of Nature does not always, by reason of certain traverses in *free agency*, produce its designed effects. Not *inexpedient;* since, in that other manner, the *power* of the divine Administration is more sensibly manifested; as in the first way his *Wisdom* may be better collected: While, both together serve more fully to convince us, that the first Cause is a free Agent; and that the constitution of Nature is his ordinance; and not the effect of chance or destiny.

On these accounts, a reasonable analogy would lead us to conclude, from what passeth in the government of the natural world, that in the early ages of mankind, when an equal Providence prevailed (as it did while men retained the knowledge of their Governor and Creator; of which more in its proper place) God would frequently interpose, in an extraordinary manner, to prevent or redress those irregularities which would, from time to time, arise, and did actually arise in God's *moral government*, while *solely* administered by that relative order of things, which his *wisdom* had so beautifully connected, and so firmly established, as to be disordered by nothing but the traverses of *free agency* in his Creatures.

That he did thus, in fact, interpose, holy Scriptures bear full evidence. The first account we have of it, after the Deluge (in which, this part of God's moral administration was so signally displayed) is in the fate of *Sodom and Gomorrah:* And afterwards, in the extermination of the Canaanites: both these nations having, by the same unnatural crimes, *filled up the measure of their iniquities.*

In the case of *Sodom and Gomorrah*, the enormity of their vices, and the total depravity of their manners, impose silence on the most profligate opposers of Religion, however clamorous they may be in the Patronage of

the *Canaanites*. Their Plea, in favour of these, arises from the Choice God is said to have made of the INSTRUMENTS of his Vengeance. *Fire and Brimstone* they easily submit to: but *Fire and Sword* revolts their humanity.

They can never (they tell us) be brought to believe that the common Father of All would employ some of his reasonable Creatures to execute his vengeance upon others of the same species, even though these others had been justly sentenced to perdition for their beastly and inhuman Vices.

They pretend to say, "that God could not, consistently with his nature and attributes, put fellow-creatures on such an employment." They have offered no reasons for this bold assertion: and I can find none. In the mean time, we must needs be much edified with the modesty of these men; who deny that liberty to God, which they are not backward to allow to their earthly Sovereigns: Amongst whom, the right of employing *one* part of their Subjects to execute their Sentence on *another*, is every where practised, without censure or control.

But they say further, "that although God *might*, yet he certainly *would not* have recourse to *human agency* in this matter, on account of the mischiefs which such agency was likely to produce.

First, as it is extremely liable to abuse. Every Pretender to a divine command, whether feigned by an Impostor, or fancied by an Enthusiast, would, when supported by this example, never suffer their Neighbours to live in peace. And Saracen armies and Popish Crusades would be always at hand to carry on desolation in the name of God."

Secondly, "this *instrumentality* must have an ill effect on the MANNERS of the Israelites, by making their hearts callous, and insensible to the calamities of their Fellow-Creatures." These are the objections of our PHILOSOPHERS. But before they give us time to reply, they kindly take the trouble off our hands, and will needs answer for us, themselves. This is one of their usual tricks, to stop or cover the disgrace of a foolish Sophism, by a shew of candour. But, indeed, their aim is to draw the Advocate of religion from solid ground, which is fairly and steadily to confute infidelity, ON ITS OWN PRINCIPLES. Of this slight of hand, the Poet Voltaire has here given us an example most worthy of him.—*This* [the extermination of the Canaanites] *had been an enormous crime, had not God himself,* THE SOVEREIGN ARBITER OF LIFE AND DEATH, *of whose conduct we are not to ask a reason, so ordained, in the impenetrable depths of his justice.*—Indeed! But we will be bold to bring him back to the state of the question.—"God the MORAL GOVERNOR of the World could not or would not" (say unbelievers) "make use of *human Instruments* for the destruction of the Canaanites." This is the objection. But to keep us from answering, they take the business into their own hands—*God* (says this prince of Philosophers) *the* CREATOR, *the sovereign arbiter of life and death, of whose conduct we are not to ask, what doest thou? hath foreclosed all reasoning, in the impenetrable depths of his Justice.*"

Thus they raise their objection against a command of God, as MORAL GOVERNOR of the Universe (and such he is always represented in Scripture); and then, to stop our mouths with a Flamm, answer the objection themselves, by putting a PHYSICAL CREATOR in his place.

Now, of the actions of a MORAL GOVERNOR, we may, with due modesty and humility, ask the reason;—*Shall not* THE JUDGE OF ALL THE EARTH *do right?* was asked* in a similar case, by the *Father of the Faithful.*

* Gen. xviii. 25.

But, to the PHYSICAL CREATOR *of the Universe*, who will venture to say, *what doest thou?* *—Illustrious Philosopher! permit us therefore to answer for ourselves. We say, that the *moral Governor* of the World can never be debarred from carrying on his Administration in such a way as may best suit the ends of divine Wisdom, because human folly may encourage itself to raise, on that ground, an impious and abusive imitation. And, neither under *natural*, nor under *revealed Religion*, hath God thought fit to exempt or secure his *Laws* from such abuses.

God, under *natural Religion*, in the ordinary course of his Providence, hath, by annexing evil to Vice, made that Constitution of things the *Instrument* of punishment; but how hath this Dispensation been dishonoured, and even to the disturbance of Society itself, when these punishments, interpreted by ignorant or uncharitable men, have been turned into EXTRAORDINARY JUDGMENTS?—Again, *Peter* and *John* said, what every honest Deist is ready to say,—*We must obey God rather than Man.*† Yet how perpetually has this truth been abused by Rebels and Fanatics.

Under *Revealed Religion*, MIRACLES (the necessary Credential of those intrusted with its promulgation) by which Power, both the physical and intellectual Systems were controlled, have yet occasioned innumerable abuses, defiling every age of the Church with fantastic Prodigies, and lying Wonders.

But why do I speak of these sanctions of Revelation, (the Credentials of God's Messengers) when the very Communication of his Will to Man, REVELATION itself, hath filled all ages and nations with Impostors, pretending to a divine Commission?

But our *Philosophers* go on; and say, "That this office of destruction, imposed upon the Israelites, must have produced an ill effect on their *Moral Character*, by giving them wrong notions of the *divine Nature;* and by vitiating *their own;* as it had a tendency to destroy or to weaken the Social passions and affections."

Nay, further, they pretend to see the marks of these evils in the Character of the *chosen People:* whom, therefore, instead of pitying, (and if the evils arose from the cause they assign, were most deserving of pity) they have most mercilessly abused and misrepresented. But to answer to the FIRST PART of this infidel objection, which pretends that the Jews were brought, by this employment, to entertain *wrong ideas of the Divine Nature*, I reply,—The most adorable attribute of God, the *moral Governor* of the world, is his LONG-SUFFERING, by which he bears with the crimes and follies of men, in order to bring them to repentance: Now this attribute he hath made manifest to all: but more fully to his *chosen People;* even in the very case of these devoted Canaanites. For when their crimes were arrived at the height of human depravity, He still withheld his hand, and, by divers awakening judgments, gave them time and invitation for repentance. But on their neglect and contempt of his repeated warnings, He, at length, was *forced*, as it were, to pour out his full vengeance upon them.

The Author of the Apocryphal Book, of *the Wisdom of Solomon*, thus graphically paints their case, in an Address to the Almighty.—"Thou hast mercy upon all—thou winkest at the Sins of Men, because they should amend—Thou sparest all; for they are thine, thou Lover of Souls!—Therefore thou chastenest them, by little and little, that offend: and warnest them by putting them in remembrance wherein they have offended; that leaving their wickedness, they may believe in thee, O Lord! FOR IT

* Job ix. 12. † Acts v. 29.

WAS THY WILL TO DESTROY BY THE HANDS OF OUR FATHERS, THOSE OLD INHABITANTS OF THY HOLY LAND; whom thou hatest for doing most odious works of Sorceries, and WICKED SACRIFICES—*merciless murderers of children, and devourers of man's flesh, and the feasts of blood*—Nevertheless even those thou sparedst *as Men*,* and didst *send Wasps*, forerunners of thine host, to destroy them by little and little—executing thy judgments upon them by little and little, THOU GAVEST THEM PLACE OF REPENTANCE; not being ignorant that they were a naughty Generation—and their cogitations would never be changed."†

The Canonical Books of Scripture authenticate what this Sage Writer of after-times here delivers, concerning God's dealing with these *devoted Nations*.

Moses, on the egression of the Israelites from Egypt, speaks thus to them, in the Person of the Almighty—"I will send *Hornets* before thee, which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite from before thee. I will not drive them out from before thee in one year, lest the land become desolate; but by *little and little* will I drive them out from before thee."‡ And again in his last exhortation to his People,—"Behold the Lord, thy God, will send the *Hornet* amongst them, until they that are left, and hide themselves from thee, be destroyed."§ And Joshua, on the like occasion, tells the People that what Moses had promised, in the name of the God of Israel, God had fulfilled—"*I sent the* HORNET before you, which drove them out from before you, even the two Kings of the Amorites." ||

Here, the Reader may observe, that the *Apocryphal* Writer gives *one* reason for the *temporary* plagues, which forerun the total destruction of the Canaanites; and the Authentic Text gives another; nor will the learned Reader be at a loss to account for this difference.

The Israelites, under their Leader, *Moses*, did not want to be told, that those *temporary Plagues* were sent in *mercy*. They had, on the first opening of his Commission, been instructed by him, in the attributes of the true God, *his long suffering and bearing with the contradiction of Sinners;* and his merciful acceptance even of a late-delayed Repentance. They had experienced the unwearied exertion of this attribute, even in their own case, when their repeated perversities, which would have tired out every thing, but *infinite Goodness*, were as often pardoned as they were committed. So that *they* were not ignorant, though their degenerate Posterity, in the time of this Apocryptical Writer, might want to be informed of the gracious purpose, in those warnings to a devoted People.

And as there was another use in these probationary plagues, viz. the wasting the Inhabitants of Canaan, this was the design which Moses and Joshua principally insist on, as it was the greatest encouragement to a dastardly People. *Moses*, in the name of his Master, promised *to send* HORNETS *before them, which* SHOULD DRIVE OUT *the Hivite, &c.* And *Joshua* reminds his People how the promise had been performed—*God sent the* HORNET *before you, which drove them out from before you*, &c.

This assurance was no more than needed. The cowardice contracted in a long state of Slavery; (a State fairly recorded, and deeply lamented by their Leader) required the assistance of all NATURE in their support.

"O nimium dilecte Deo—cui militat Æther,
Et conjurati veniunt ad Classica venti."

* That is, for the sake of their rational nature, though by their unnatural vices they had forfeited all the prerogatives of humanity. † Wisdom of Solomon xi. 23, et seq.; xii. 2, et seq. ‡ Exod. xxiii. 28—30. § Deut. vii. 20. || Joshua xxiv. 12.

But though these *warning Judgments*, these *chastisements of mercy*, were lost on those to whom they were sent, yet they were not cast away; for, in aggravating the Crimes of the *Canaanites*, they served, at the same time, to promote their speedier extermination. So admirably is the moral government of God administered, that it's acts, directed to various purposes, are never issued in vain.—But what is said in holy Writ, of the previous punishments on the Canaanites, in mercy, is given only as a specimen of them, and not for a complete list, as in the record of the *trying* plagues of Egypt. So that we are not to conclude, that the destructive Animals, sent amongst these miscreants, were only wasps and hornets; or that, amongst the awakening punishments, DISEASE was not one. When God was pleased, in after-times, to punish their Descendants, the *Philistines*, for their prophanation of the ARK; (which, for the sins of his people, he suffered to fall into their hands) the sacred writers tell us, that they, who so prophaned it, *were smitten with emerods in their secret parts.** This is the only punishment there mentioned. Yet, by the account of the atonement, or *trespass-offering*, it appears that there was *another*.—The Philistines sent back with the Ark, which they restored, *the images of five emerods*, and FIVE MICE IN GOLD.† Who can doubt, but that, in this addition to the atonement, another punishment was intimated, viz. the *devastation of their Lands by mice?* But the sacred Writer does not leave us to mere conjecture. In speaking of these mice, he thus qualifies them,—*Mice that* MARR THE LAND. But this is not all. The text here acquaints us, though occasionally, with two punishments, inflicted on the *Canaanites;* which the history of their expulsion does not particularly mention.—We understand how fit Instruments of general devastation MICE must needs be: and we may guess how well suited the *other punishment* was for their unnatural Crimes; nor would either one, or the other, cease to remind them of the vices or punishments of their Ancestors, the Canaanites, so that, avoiding the manners of their ancestors, they might (if possible) escape their total destruction.

I shall conclude this point with an observation which naturally leads to the next, that is to say, to the SECOND PART of this infidel objection, viz. "the EFFECT which the destruction of the Canaanites must be supposed to have on the minds of the MORAL INSTRUMENTS of their punishment." A matter most deserving our attention.

It cannot be doubted but that the Almighty displayed his mercy and long suffering on *Sodom and Gomorrah*, in some way analogous to what he practised in the Land of *Canaan*, (and how gracious he was in the extent of that mercy, we learn from Abraham's intercession for those Cities‡) though the particulars of it be not recorded by the sacred historian: Whose silence in the one case, and not in the other, may be clearly understood. Those execrable Cities were destroyed *immediately* by God's own hand, in letting loose the *Elements* (the treasurers of his wrath) upon them.—In the deletion of the Canaanites, he was pleased to employ HUMAN INSTRUMENTS. These were to be used according to their nature; not as Entities merely *Physical*, but as *moral agents* likewise: Beings not only endowed with *Sense*, but *Sentiment*. Now it seemed but fit that such *agents* should be instructed in the reason and occasion of their Commission; especially as it was a matter of high importance; no less than to preserve them from judging perversely of the divine attributes. Accordingly Moses obviated this mischief by a detail of the abominable manners of this devoted People: together with a memorial of the ineffectual issue of their many *chastisements in mercy* to bring them to repentance, and to save them from utter deletion.

* 1 Sam. v. 6. † 1 Sam. vi. 4, 5. ‡ Gen. xviii.

As the mischief was thus effectually obviated, the *Israelites* were, at the same time, secured from that other, (which is the second point objected to their Commission) it's tendency to vitiate the most amiable passion of our nature, by destroying or weakening the benign and social feelings for the miseries of our fellow creatures. For what could God's gracious dealing with these incorrigible Miscreants teach all, who (like the Israelites) were intimately informed of their crimes, and long delayed punishment, but, in imitation of God's long forbearance, to shew mercy and compassion to their offending Brethren in distress. Nor, in fact, do we find that the *Jews* were more steeled to, or insensible of, the calamities of humanity (bating those of this devoted People) than other men, in the early Ages of society, were wont to be. And if they were not much more humanized, by being *better taught, as well as fed*, than the rest of mankind, it must be ascribed, not to this *Commission*, but to a certain *native perversity*, which (as strange as it may at first sight appear) might be one, amongst the very many reasons of God's choice of them, for his PECULIAR, as it made them the properest subjects to work upon, for a fuller manifestation of his infinite mercy towards the Sons of Men. Where it might be seen, in the *deviations* from right of two People thus connected and related, that the *one* was destroyed, after all means had been employed, without effect, to bring them to REPENTANCE; and the *other* pardoned and highly favoured, when the same merciful forbearance had produced its fruit of a timely REPENTANCE, and return to GOD, after every transgression; and, at length, a determined perseverance in this their capital duty (adherence to the true God) for many ages, even to the present time.

But it may still be asked, though no mischief was derived towards the *Instruments* of this extraordinary Commission, yet what good could such a *commission* produce? I answer, much, and constant; for besides a *political* benefit to an abject unwarlike people, in teaching them the use of arms; who were to make their destined way to Empire, as well by their own power, as by the extraordinary aid of the Almighty; in order to avoid a lavish waste of miracles: besides this, (I say) there were *moral advantages*, great and lasting, derived to this Instrumentality. Horror and aversion in the *Israelites* to those unnatural Crimes which had occasioned the deletion of the *Canaanites;* whose punishment must be intimately impressed on the minds of the *chosen People*, by their being appointed the executioners of God's vengeance. To confirm this, we may observe, that both *Moses* and *Joshua*, by incessantly reminding them of the horrid depravity of that devoted People, had their eyes always intent upon this good effect.

P. 386. H. The eloquent *Bossuet* saith rightly, that *Protestants* have but lamely supported the FIGURE, *of* THIS IS MY BODY, &c. by those—*I am the vine—I am the door.*—And the reason he gives has its weight.—*Jesus* (says he) *in the institution of the Lord's Supper, was neither propounding a parable, nor explaining an Allegory**—But when the learned Writer would have us infer from this, that there could be no other occasion for the use of a FIGURE, he imposes his usual artifice upon us; which was always to keep out of sight what would have detected his slight of hand. He knew there were other occasions, of employing *figurative* expressions, such as *fixing and declaring the* NATURE OF A RITE.—And this was the *occasion* here.—But then, says he, the words are detached and separated from all

* "Quand les uns opposoient, *Ceci est mon corps*, les autres repondoient, *Je suis le vigne—Je suis la porte—le pierre etoit Christ*—Il est vrai que ces examples n'etoient pas semblables. Ce n'etoit ni en proposant une parabole, ni en expliquant une allegorie."

other discourse—there is no leading preparation.*—So say the *Socinians* likewise; in order to infer a contrary conclusion. But we have already shewn, that they are both mistaken.

There was a *leading preparation;* and that, a plain one, namely, the celebration of the paschal Supper. And we have shewn, it was the custom of our Lord to be *led* by what passed before him, to regulate his language on ideas thus prepared.—Nor was the *consecration* of the Elements in the SUPPER OF OUR LORD SEPARATE *from all other discourse.* It was preceded by, and connected with, a most affecting *discourse* on the *death and sufferings* of our *Redeemer.* Therefore the words of the Consecration do not, as M. Bossuet pretends, *carry their whole meaning within themselves;* but refer to things preceding and exterior. So that the Bishop's triumphant conclusion loses much of its lustre, when he says, *what I pretend to evince is, the embarras into which these words*—THIS IS MY BODY, *throws all the Protestant party—there was no reason for using these* STRONG TERMS *for the Institution of the Eucharist rather than for Baptism. This place I foretell shall be the eternal and inevitable confusion of the defenders of the* FIGURATIVE SENSE.† *There was no more reason, on the Protestant principles,* (says he) *for chusing these* STRONG TERMS *here, than in the rite of Baptism.* Surely, there was a very good one. For if it was the purpose of divine Wisdom to explain the nature of the Rite, *only by the words of the Consecration,* which it is agreed it was, as well by him who holds it to be a *real Sacrifice,* as by us who hold it is only a *feast upon Sacrifice,* there was a necessity for the use of these terms. This was not the case in instituting the Rite of Baptism, whose nature is *expressly* defined. Besides, here the matter, administered, was WATER, an element always at hand, and therefore fitly called by its *proper name.* But the FLESH and BLOOD of the Sacrifice, of which the *Lord's supper* was a festive commemoration, not being then at hand, as Christ was not yet offered on the Cross, the Elements of *Bread and Wine,* substituted in their place, were, by an elegant and necessary conversion, called the *body* and *blood,* as these elements only were declarative of the nature of the Rite, viz. a *feast upon Sacrifice.*—To support this reasoning still further. Another sacred Rite, that of the *imposition of hands,* in procuring the descent of the HOLY SPIRIT, is called the BAPTISM BY FIRE; in which, both the terms are *figurative,* as, in the *Baptism by Water,* both are literal. And why this difference? Because the Agent or Instrument of this *Baptism by Fire* being *spiritual,* there was need of *figurative terms,* taken from material things, to aid the grossness of our conceptions, concerning the manner of the operation. So that all the mystery in this affair, (I mean, so far forth as concerns the *terms of the institution*) is no more than this; when the things communicated are of a spiritual nature, as the gifts of the holy Spirit; or of a material nature not yet *in esse,* as the flesh of a Sacrifice, not yet offered up, and therefore needing another body to be substituted in its place, there, the employing *figurative terms* becomes necessary. But when the thing communicated is a material Substance, at hand, and actually capable of being employed, as *Water in Baptism,* it would rather confound, than aid our conceptions, to use *improper,* that is, *figurative* terms.

P. 389. I. They had one *common nature* so far as they really conveyed, or were foolishly imagined to convey, benefits to the participants. But St. Paul joining to the *Christian* and the *Jewish,* the *Gentile* sacrificial Feasts,

* "Ces paroles [ceci est mon Corps, &c.] detachées de tout autre discours, portent tout leur sens en elles-mêmes." † "Cet endroit sera l'eternelle et inevitable confusion des Defenseurs du SENS FIGURE'."—*Hist. des Var.* tom. i. p. 477, 8vo.

he thought it *logically* necessary to make a distinction between the *real* and the *imaginary* benefits; which he does in this manner—*What say I then? that an* IDOL *is any thing; or that which is offered to Idols is any thing? No*, (says he) *both are nothing*, i. e. are equally incapable of conveying benefits. That this must be his meaning, appears from his predicating the same thing both of the *Idol* and the *offering*. Now as the *offering* had a PHYSICAL existence, what hindered but that, in his opinion, the *Idol* might have a METAPHYSICAL? Though in an efficacious and MORAL sense, Both were *nothing*. This interpretation shews that the Apostle was perfectly consistent, when just before he calls these *Idols* NOTHING, and yet, presently after, says they were DEVILS, whom, we know, in his opinion, were SOMETHING. The calling these *Idols*, *Devils*, served to explain his meaning when he said *Idols* were *nothing*, to be this, that no *benefit* was to be expected from them. And to intimate yet further, that so far from receiving benefit from *Idols*, their Worshippers, by this intercourse with them, were subject to great harm and mischief. In order to insinuate this latter assertion, the Apostle changes his *first* idea of an *Idol*, which he used in common with the Gentiles, to this *second*, which he, and all the Christians of that time, had of them.—The *Idols*, to whom the Gentiles intentionally sacrificed, were their national Gods, the *celestial Bodies*, their *dead Ancestors;* their *Kings and Benefactors;* all of them, long ago, engrafted into the public worship. From such, the Apostle owns, they could receive neither good nor harm; these being only IDOLS OF THE BRAIN.—But SATAN or the DEVIL, as the Original Author and still the fomenter of Idolatry, makes him properly and peculiarly the IDOL OF THE ALTAR. From such an *Idol*, they, to whom the Apostle writes, must readily confess, much harm would arise from communicating with him, in a *Sacrificial* or sacramental feast.

Of this capital Enemy of Mankind the Gentiles themselves had, somehow or other, received an obscure tradition; plentifully, indeed, contaminated with fable; which they still further polluted with new-invented Superstitions. Yet these still preserving a few traces of resemblance to the *Mosaic History*, and occasioning some conformity between the languages of error and revelation, have drawn unwary men into some dangerous conclusions, as if the Founders of our holy Religion had taken advantage of Pagan follies to form a system of DEMONOLOGY, agreeable to the preconceived fancies of their CONVERTS.—But of this, more in its place. The present occasion rather leads us to admire the Art by which the Sacred Writer has conducted his argument.

P. 405. K. It should seem most probable that the *miraculous powers* were, in general, occasional and temporary. But a learned Writer, who has declared himself of this opinion, hath unwarily put the *gift of tongues* into the number—

"The Gift of Tongues upon the day of Pentecost" (says he) "*was not lasting, but instantaneous and transitory;* not bestowed upon them for the constant work of the Ministry, but as an *occasional sign only*, that a person endowed with it was a chosen minister of the Gospel: which sign, as soon as it had served that particular purpose, seems to have ceased, and totally to have vanished."*

Would reason, or the truth of things, suffer us to be thus compliant, we might concede to Unbelievers all which they fancy the Learned Writer hath procured for them, "that the power of tongues was temporary, and, like the power of *healing*, possessed occasionally," without being alarmed at any consequence they will be able to deduce from it. For let it be

* DR. MIDDLETON'S "Essay on the Gift of Tongues," vol. ii. of his Works, p. 79.

granted, that the gift of tongues returned as often as they had occasion for its use, and it is no great matter *where* it resided in the interim.

But neither reason, nor the truth of things, will suffer us to be thus complaisant. The power of *healing the diseased* (to which Dr. M. compares the *gift of tongues*) is, during the whole course of its operation, one continued arrest or diversion of the general laws of matter and motion; it was therefore very fitting that this power should be imparted *occasionally*. But the *gift of tongues*, when once it was conferred, became, from thenceforth, a natural power; just as the free and perfect use of the members of the Body, after they had been restored, by miracle, to the exercise of their natural functions. Indeed, the loss of this *gift of tongues*, after the temporary use of it, would imply *other* miracles, as oft as there was occasion to restore what was lost by actual deprivation. Unless we can suppose that the Apostles, in the exercise of this gift, were merely irrational organs, *Automati*, through which certain sounds were conveyed. In a word, it was as much in the course of nature for an Apostle, when the holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost had enabled him to speak a strange language, ever afterwards to have the use of that language, as it was for the Cripple, whom Jesus had restored to the use of his limbs on the sabbath day, ever afterwards to walk, to run, and perform all the functions of a man perfectly sound and entire.

In one thing, indeed, the power of *healing the diseased*, and of *speaking with strange tongues*, agreed.—As the Disciples could not heal at all times, and when they would; so neither could they speak when they would, in an unknown tongue, when it was first essayed. Yet when the holy Spirit had once enabled them to speak and understand a Language till then unknown to them, I conceive they must retain the use of it with the same facility as if they had acquired it in the ordinary way of instruction.

But the confusion in this matter, and the embarras which follows it, in the Doctor's stating the Question, arise from not distinguishing between the *active power* and the *passive gift*. In healing the diseased, the Apostles are to be considered as the *Workers of a Miracle;* in speaking a strange tongue, as *Subjects of a miracle performed.**

P. 418. L. The serious Reader will be ready to ask, what learned discoveries they are which have encouraged these men to innovate from the common opinion concerning the Gospel Demoniacs? Have they found in the Scripture history of the *Demoniacs* any thing either *hurtful to morals*, or *false in Physics?* Nothing of either. And yet whatever is found there, they are not the finders.

An excellent Divine of the last age had, in his extensive researches into antiquity, collected, that both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, at and before the time of *Christ*, were infected with one common Superstition, that *Demons* and the *Souls of wicked men deceased* frequently seized upon the *bodies of the living*, and tormented them in various ways. Hence he too hastily, yet with his usual modesty, insinuated, that the *Possessions* recorded in the Gospel, and called *demoniacal*, might be of that imaginary sort; and no other in reality than OCCULT DISEASES; which being intractable by the art of medicine, were supposed to be *supernatural* (as if a good Physician was a match for any thing but the *Devil*).—To the unhappy wretches so afflicted, he supposed that Jesus might apply his salutary hands: and that to this malady, so

* He who would see a more complete account of this whole affair and its dependencies, is recommended to the FIRST BOOK *of the Doctrine of Grace, or the Office and Operation of the Holy Spirit*, third edition, Lond. 1763.

relieved, the People gave the *fashionable* name by which, at that time, it was commonly distinguished.

Without doubt this truly learned Divine went the more readily into this bold opinion, as he had observed it to have been God's gracious method, in the course of his DISPENSATIONS, to take advantage of men's habitual prejudices, towards the support of his Revelation, by keeping his servants attached to his Ordinances.

But, here, the excellent person should have distinguished (as his Followers* were not likely to do it for him) between RITES and DOCTRINES. As they were RITES only, of which God was pleased to avail himself, for the benefit of his People, in order to combat, or to elude, their fondness for Pagan usages.—In matters of DOCTRINE, the like compliance was not, nor could be, safely indulged to them, without violating the truth of things; and therefore Sacred Scripture affords us no example of such a condescension. In things pertaining only to *Rites* we have, indeed, many instances. Thus the use of *linen-garments*, *lighted lamps*, *lustrations*, and a multitude of other usages, in themselves indifferent, were brought out of *false* Religions into the *true:* and this, with high propriety and wisdom, while their new destination sanctified their use; and their use served to the easier introduction of the *new establishment*.—But to assert and support a groundless, superstitious *opinion* (if such it were) of *Diabolical possessions*, would be the infecting and contaminating the Christian Faith.

However, if the admirable Author of this hurtful Novelty did himself miss of so just and obvious a distinction, we have less reason to wonder that those of his Followers, who only aimed at something, by a faint reflection from the other's learning, should not hit (as we have said) upon what their Master had overlooked.

A late eminent Physician, who hath borrowed this notion professedly from this great man, acted a more modest and becoming part. He might pretend, by virtue of his Profession, and still more by his superior skill in it, to a profounder insight into *Nature:* At the same time, *Theology* being in another department, he was the more excusable, if he did not see all that this *Divine* Science opposed to the Opinion; an Opinion, which might be said to descend to him by inheritance from his great namesake and relation: whose conciseness, strength, and modesty of reasoning, he hath so well copied, that to confute objections so borrowed, will be to overthrow the whole System of the *Antidemoniac* Party.†

In his *Medica Sacra*, he hath a chapter *de dæmoniacis;* in which he hath treated the Evangelic History with all that decency and reverence which becomes a true Scholar and a serious Professor of the Christian Faith.

The first observation I shall make, in the entrance on his argument, is general; and will serve to confute all who have written on the Question. It is this—Our Antidemoniasts reason upon the case, not as they find it recorded by the *Evangelists*, but as they see it described only in a treatise of Medicine, by Aretæus, Fernelius, or any other of the faculty, where it stands unconnected with all *moral* as well as *religious* inquiries. But it hath been shewn at large, that these *demoniacal possessions* have a close relation to the Doctrine of REDEMPTION; and were therefore reasonably to

* Dr. Sykes—Dr. Lardner, &c. &c.

† "Ut redeam autem ad Dæmoniacos; non mea est, profecto, sed aliorum ante me pietate et doctrina præstantium virorum sententia quam hic propono. Et proximo quidem sæculo, inter nostrates etiam JOSEPHUS MEADUS, Theologus, rerum sacrarum cognitione nulli secundus, luculenta dissertatione eam propugnavit. *Cum ex eadem, igitur, ac ille, familia sim oriundus,*" &c.—*Præf.* in *Med. Sacr.* p. ix. Authore RICHARDO MEAD.

be expected at the first promulgation of the GOSPEL. This sets the matter on quite another footing: and that plausible reasoning, which attends the learned person's representation, entirely disappears, when we put the case as it was in fact.

1. This proper precaution, against so defective and foreign a representation of the case, being premised, I now proceed to the reasoning employed by our learned Physician to discredit the common Opinion of a *real possession.*

His first argument stands on the extent of the Superstition, which gave birth to so many *imaginary possessions.*

"*It had not only infected the *Mosaic* Religion in particular, but had overrun *paganism* in general."—"As to the Jews, who were wont to ascribe whatever there was of prodigious in *nature*, to the MINISTRY OF ANGELS, they were easily brought to believe, that those dire diseases, which infected the Mind and Body equally and at once, and whose causes were unknown, could be no other than the work of the DEVIL."†

Let us allow all this—Let us allow that the Jews, at the time of Christ, were very superstitious in this matter. But then the learned Doctor, in his turn, will allow, that the Teachers of the Gospel, in the fulness of their inspiration, must needs be secure from an error, which so dreadfully affected the Religion they were intrusted to propagate, as *Demonianism* did, if it were an error. And if so, they *knowingly* and designedly gave it countenance and support. But how that will agree with their character and office, we shall see, as we go along.

Our Learned Doctor tells us further, "that the Jews not only gave credit to the works of the *Devil*, but believed in the *ministry* of ANGELS likewise."—This seems to be one of those slips of the pen, to which Truth sometimes betrays those who write most cautiously against her; especially when they act the part of Believers; which, however, I will not suspect was the case here. For the *Old Testament*, which the learned Doctor reverences equally with the *New*, bears ample testimony to the *real ministry of Angels;* and with such circumstances attending it, as will not permit a Believing Caviller to evade it, by having recourse to *vision*, *figure*, or *accommodation.* For if the *Angel* who waylaid Balaam may be reduced to a dusky dream, those whom Abraham entertained in Broad daylight were more substantial. When, therefore, the learned Person puts the ministry and malice of good and bad angels on the same footing, he must confess that, if the *reality* of the former be proved, the *reality* of the latter will follow.

As to the abounding Superstition, in this matter, both amongst *Jews* and *Gentiles*, I do not see how that, in the least, alters the case. The *Jews*, of this time, by a more enlarged and unrestrained Commerce with their Pagan neighbours, had defiled the purity of their holy Religion by many opinions borrowed from the Gentile *Philosophers.* Thus they took, we may well suppose, the *Doctrine of Demons* from PLATO, and the pre-existence (if not a *future state)* from PYTHAGORAS. Notwithstanding, it is certain, that both

* "At non Judæis tantum, sed et aliis etiam gentibus in usu fuit insanos pro demoniacis habere."—P. 76. "A Chaldæis quidem ad Phœnices, postea ad Egyptios propagata, ad Græcos deinde, hinc ad Romanos aliasque demum gentes temporis progressu Demoniaca ista Religio pervenit."—P. 74.

† "Judæi autem, siquid faceret *Natura*, ad ANGELORUM *supremi Dei Ministrorum* operam referre soliti, facile in animum sibi inducere poterant, ut diras quasdam crederent ægritudines quæ mentem simul et corpus læderent, et quarum causas cognoscere nequirent, ab angelorum malorum ἐνεργείαις exoriri."—P. 74.

Demoniacal possessions and *future rewards and punishments* are equally supported by the acts and doctrine of Jesus and his Disciples.

This too, let me observe—The Doctrines of the FALL and of the REDEMPTION (the two principles on which our holy Religion rises) are interwoven into the substance of the Christian Faith. If therefore we can suppose *Demonianism* to be only a threadbare fable, new-dressed, and offered, by way of *accommodation*, to amuse the followers of the *Gospel*, I cannot see what hinders our supposing, with SYNESIUS, a *future state* itself to be no more.

Both Opinions had the advantage of old prejudice in their favour. Yet if only one of them were true (namely, that of a *future state*), and the other of *Demonianism*, taught but by way of *accommodation*, we see, it could hold its ground no otherwise than from the *difficulty* of erasing it from the popular belief: yet so uncomfortable a doctrine, one should think, might be removed with very little trouble.

Nay, Jesus was even invited to help forward, as it were, its discredit, had it been only a delusion. A Father* mistook his Son's disorder to be LUNACY, when, according to the Historian, it was a DIABOLIC POSSESSION. And as such, Jesus treats it. *He rebukes the* DEVIL, *who departed out of the Child, and he was cured from that very hour.* And to prevent all mistake in this matter, when the Father had told Jesus that his Disciples could not cure the *Child*, our Lord, after upbraiding his followers for their *want of faith*, tells them, however, that this *miracle* of *dispossession*, the most difficult of all, required a more extraordinary preparation for the work, than any other, by acts of piety and humiliation. For which assertion an obvious reason may be assigned, this *victory* over *Satan* being a certain mark, that the *Redemption* was compleated and accomplished, this evidence of it was fitly reserved to be bestowed on the most perfect of the followers of Christ. Yet had the Satanic part been only a popular fancy, Jesus here might have decried it with advantage, while he had the Father of the sufferer on his side; who considered his Son's disease as a *Lunacy* only.

It may be said, perhaps, that the Doctrines of a *future state*, and that of *Demoniacal possessions*, which I put upon the same footing of Credibility (because the Gospel hath so put them), differ in this, that a *future state* may be proved by natural reason, which *Demoniacal possessions* cannot.—But what doth this objection infer more than this? that a *future state* makes part of NATURAL RELIGION; and *Demoniacal possessions*, a part of the REVEALED.

2. The ingenuous Discourser brings another objection to these *possessions*—Having collected together all the SYMPTOMS of this disorder, from *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke*, he concludes thus—"All these are the *Symptoms* of a natural disorder. They are more surprising, indeed, than those of other disorders, yet nothing supernatural."†—His learned Fellow Collegiate, Dr. *J. Freind*, treating the same subject, after he hath given us, from Ætius and Oribasius, a description of the madness called *Lycanthropy*, of which, one of the most striking SYMPTOMS was a fondness to *wander amongst the Sepulchres of the dead*, adds—*the Demoniac in the Scriptures, who was* POSSESSED WITH A LIKE SORT OF MADNESS, *is represented as having his dwelling amongst the Tombs.*‡

The opinion of these two learned Naturalists is founded, we see, in this

* Matt. xvii. 15. † "Insanorum sunt hæc omnia; utrum vero a Dæmoniis, an vi morbi provenerint, disceptatur—neque enim alius quisquam inter omnes, qui humanum genus infestant, morbus tam naturæ vim excedere videtur."—P. 66. ‡ "History of Physic," part i. pp. 16—21.

circumstance—"that the *Symptoms* of a demoniacal possession are the same with those of some natural disorders."—But now, if *evil spirits* were permitted to disturb the vital functions of the human frame, whether in the solids, the fluids, or in both together; can we have any conception how this could be effected without causing or occasioning, in *supernatural disorders*, the very same SYMPTOMS which accompany *natural maladies?* These Symptoms, in both cases, must arise from the disturbance of the material Frame, and can arise no otherwise; and those disturbances, whether produced by a spiritual Agent, or by material causes, must produce the same *sensible* effects. *Madness*, for instance, whether occasioned by the malignity of an intelligent Agent *ab extra*, or by discordant humours *ab intra*, will be still *madness*, and accompanied with the same Symptoms. That appearance, therefore, which must accompany a *Demoniacal possession*, IF REAL, can never by any rules of logic be converted into a reasonable argument for the falsehood of such a possession.

It is worth observation, that one of the *Evangelists* being a Physician, our learned Critic, by a very becoming partiality, prefers him to the rest. St. LUKE (he tells us) being superior to them *for the purity and accuracy of his expression, when there is occasion to speak of distempers, or of the cure of them; and is more particular in reciting all the miracles of our Saviour in relation to healing, than the other Evangelists are.**

All this is true; and yet St. Luke speaks the very same language with the rest concerning *demoniacal possessions*. Now if the *Gospel Demoniacs* were men only labouring under natural disorders, a Physician, by his deeper insight into Nature, with the assistance of inspiration to boot, was very likely to have discovered the mistake; and for the glory of his art as likely to have recorded it: especially as the detection of it was the overturning a hurtful Superstition. And we know how ready these benevolent Gentlemen have ever been to detect VULGAR ERRORS.—Not to insist, at present, that St. Luke was guided, in so good a work, by a stronger passion than *honour for his profession*, as a Physician, that is, *a love for truth*, as an Evangelist.

This, as we say, must have been the case in *diabolic possessions*, where the *Body only* was thus supernaturally affected. Yet in those, where the *mind* alone, or equally with the *body*, suffered by these disorders, I confess, we might expect some extraordinary marks or symptoms of supernatural Agency, when it was for the purpose of the EVIL SPIRIT to display his Power. Here the *immaterial* principle within us affords larger room, and more conveniences to be acted upon, by an exterior agent: although the irregular efforts of the mind itself are so wonderful as to be frequently mistaken for a foreign agency.

Yet this notwithstanding, there are, in these mental disorders, powers exhibited, that can never be mistaken, by a careful observer, for *its own*.

Some of which, are, in fact, recorded to have been exerted; in order, as it were, to confute these learned men, who seem to think we ought to reject all *diabolic possessions* but such as are ascertained by Symptoms supernatural.

An instance of such we have in the† *Damsel possessed with the Spirit of* DIVINATION, *who brought her Master much gain* by SOOTHSAYING. This Woman, Paul dispossessed, and so spoiled her Master's trade; who thereupon raised a fierce persecution against the Apostle.

The *symptoms* of *Divination* and *Soothsaying*, that is, telling of things absent, and foretelling things future, were certainly supernatural; and, for

* "History of Physic," part i. pp. 223—225. † Acts xvi. 16, et seq.

such, must be acknowledged by the Objectors; who I hope will not yet forget the Personages, they have assumed, of Believers: against whom only this reasoning on the *Demoniacs* is directed and addressed.

Having now seen what these learned Writers have to oppose to *my* System of the Gospel-Demoniacs:

I crave leave, in the next place, to bespeak their attention to what I have to urge against *theirs*. Enough hath been said to shew that this is no trifling or unimportant Question.

The untoward consequences being these, which unavoidably follow the Concession, that Jesus and his Disciples did only *accommodate* themselves to the fanciful and superstitious opinions of the times, in placing natural distempers in the visionary Class of *Supernatural*.

1. Unbelievers may conclude (and by too many they will be supposed not to conclude amiss) that much advantage is hereby gained over the Evidences of our Faith.—While it is believed, from the testimony of the Evangelists, that *Jesus cast out Devils, and healed such as were possessed with them*, that plausible subterfuge against his miraculous cures, which pretends that the relief afforded * . . . . .

[Bishop Hurd having referred the Student, for the completion of this note, to bishop Warburton's Sermon "on the Fall of Satan," that portion of his argumentation which he omitted is here reprinted.]

UNBELIEVERS may think (and, by too many, they will be supposed not to think amiss) that they get great advantage over the Evidences of our Faith, by this concession.—While it is believed that evil Demons were subject to the power of Christ from the testimony of the Evangelists, who tell us that *he cast out Devils, and healed those possessed with them*, that plausible subterfuge against his miraculous cures, which supposes the relief afforded to be the effect of a STRONG IMAGINATION, is entirely cut off. For, however the motion of the blood and spirits might be accelerated by the agitations of a mind thus unhinged; the Devil would still keep his hold, and be nowise affected by it. But when once his agency is removed, as a groundless and superstitious terror, these men will think themselves not altogether unable to deal with the miraculous cures of the Gospel on our own principles. They will recount to us the astonishing effects of the Imagination in pregnant women, and in atrabilare and melancholy subjects; supported by cases recorded in the writings of Physicians of the greatest authority and credit.† They will remind us of the cures worked by *Greatrix the Stroker*, in the memory of our Fathers; and of those performed at *the Tomb of Abbé Paris*, in our own. They will tell us of a learned French Physician,‡ who was so struck with this astonishing force of the human Imagination, that he thought it capable of *working Miracles*, or effecting things supernatural. Nay, they will pretend to account for all this, by the mechanism of the body, unaccountably subject to the delusions of the mind, when unduly agitated either by sensation or reflection. Nor has any one borne a stronger testimony§ to these amazing delusions

* See Sermon *On the Fall of Satan*, which completes this Note.—R. W. † See FIENUS *De Viribus Imaginationis*. ‡ AUGERIUS FERRERIUS. Of whom Thuanus says, "Medicinam professus, quam et felicissimè et summo judicio fecit."—*Hist.* lib. lxxxix. § "Quid mirabilius iis, quæ in Graviditatibus non raro contingere videmus? Fœmina in utero gestans, si forte quid appetiverit, et frustra sit, interdum rei concupitæ figuram quandam, aut similitudinem, in hac aut illa corporis parte, fœtui suo imprimit. Imo, quod majus est, et prodigii instar, subita partis alicujus

than the learned person whose objections to the *Gospel Demoniacs* we have just now examined: which may seem the more strange, as the testimony is borne by one who, at the same time, expresses his surprize that Divines should contend so eagerly for this triumph of Christ over Demons, as if something were wanting to demonstrate his power, when exercised only over natural diseases.* Without doubt Divines may contend for it on that principle, without being laughed at. And I have written to little purpose, if this discourse does not prove that something would have been wanting to demonstrate, if not the power, yet the assumed character of Jesus, had it been exercised only over natural diseases. So that it appeared to me that what they contended for was highly useful; to cut off a subterfuge to which Unbelievers have had recourse, and which this learned Physician's just account of the *force of the Imagination* contributes to support.—How pertinent the inference may be, which Unbelievers draw from this *force of the Imagination*, it is not my purpose, at present, to inquire. The mischief to Religion is not inconsiderable, that diseased Nature hath afforded these PHILOSOPHERS a handle for any inference at all.

But this is not the worst. There is an unavoidable inference to be drawn from this anti-demoniac system when proved, more fatal to the truth of the Gospel than that other. It is an unquestioned fact, that the Evangelic History of the *Demoniacs* hath given occasion to the most scandalous frauds, and sottish superstitions, throughout almost every age of the Church; the whole trade of Exorcisms, accompanied with all the mummery of frantic and fanatic agitations, having arisen from thence.

Now, were the *Gospel Demoniacs really possessed*, the honour of Religion is safe; and no more affected by these ingrafted frauds and follies of the Church of Rome, than is the Law of Moses by their Inquisitorial Murders, committed under cover of God's penal Statutes against Jewish Idolaters. If men will turn the Truths of God to the support of their crimes and follies; the sacred Oracles will receive no attaint from such their malice and perversity.

But were the *Possessions*, recorded in the Gospel, imaginary; and *Demoniacs* only a name for the naturally diseased; and that yet, Jesus and his Apostles, instead of rectifying the People's follies and superstitions on this head, chose rather to inflame them, by assuring certain of the distempered that they were really *possessed by evil Spirits* over whom the name of Christ had power and authority:† if this, I say, were the case, I should tremble for the consequence: for then would Jesus and his Disciples, who were sent to propagate the TRUTH, appear to be answerable for all the mischief which the rivetting of this superstition in the minds of men, pro-

læsione perterrita matre, ipsa illa pars in infante noxam sentit, et nutrimenti defectu marcessit. Scio hujusmodi omnes historias à medicis nonnullis, quoniam, qui talia fieri possint, haud percipiunt, in dubium vocari. At multa, quæ ipse vidi, exempla mihi hac in re scrupulum omnem ademerunt. Tam stupenda autem est facultatis imaginandi vis, ut non minus falsæ quam veræ imagines afficiant, ubi mens iis assidue sit addicta. Id enim in mulieribus, quæ sagæ dicuntur, usu comperimus, quæ consimili mentis errore captæ, cum Dæmonibus non tantum consuetudinem habere, sed et pacta cum iis se inivisse, sæpe imaginantur; idque animo adeo obstinato, ut etiam in judicium vocatæ, se facinorum quæ nunquam perpetraverint, reas confiteantur, cum ob ea ipsa jam mortis supplicium subituræ sint. Proinde omnibus notum est, quam mirabilibus modis in melancholicis mens perturbatur," &c.—Pp. 70—72.

* "Sæpe quidem mirari soleo, cur fidei nostræ Antistites Dæmonas in scenam producere tantopere contendant, quo scilicet divinum Christi numen de victis hisce infernis hostibus triumphos agat. An divinam Christi virtutem gravissimorum morborum sanationes, jussu illius momento temporis peractæ, minus patefaciunt; quam malorum Geniorum ex hominum corporibus expulsiones?"—*Præf.* p. vii. † Matt. xvii. 15.

duced in after-ages: for there is not a clearer conclusion in moral science, than that He, who commits a premeditated fraud, is answerable for the evil which necessarily or naturally proceedeth from it. So little did the learned Physician, with whom we have to do, see into the Casuistry of this question, when he took it for granted, that our contending for the reality of *demoniacal possessions* makes the Gospel, and us, its Ministers who thus interpret it, answerable for all the tricks of the Church of Rome, which rise upon the avowal of it.*

On the contrary, from what hath been here said, it evidently appears, that the Opinion of the *Accommodators* (who suppose Jesus and his Disciples took advantage of a favourable superstition), and not the Opinion of those Divines who hold Gospel-Demonianism to be real, is the very thing which brings this *opprobrium* on the first Propagators of our holy Faith.

Nor can that reason which is sometimes given for permitting superstitious errors, (although this were, which it is not, of the number of such as might be suffered to hold their course) have any weight in this case; namely, *the difficulty or danger in eradicating them.*

Danger there could be none, from the nature of things. For, to remove the false terrors concerning this Enemy of mankind, could never indispose men to embrace their Saviour and Redeemer.

As little *difficult* had it been to eradicate so pernicious an error, how deeply soever rooted in the popular superstition. For when they saw Jesus cure all diseases with a word, and the *pretended Demoniac* as easily as the rest, nothing could withstand the Authority which informed them of their mistake; and assured them that this *demonianism*, like the rest, was altogether a natural distemper. On the contrary, many favourable prejudices would soon arise on the side of so authentic an Instructor.

From the whole, therefore, of what hath been here offered in favour of the obvious sense of my Text, the attentive hearer will, I presume, be inclined to acquiesce in the antient interpretation of this part of the Gospel-History; and be ready to agree with the first Disciples of Christ, in their pious exultation, when they *returned*, from their Mission, *with joy; saying, Lord, through thy name, even the* DEVILS *are subject unto us.*†

* "Erroris patrocinio non indiget veritas, uti nec vultus natura nitidus fucum requirit. Et certum est, opinionem istam, quæ jam per multa sæcula invaluit, de potentia ad corpora mentesque humanas vexandas dæmonibus adhuc permissa, variis astutorum hominum præstigiis, cum maximo rei Christianæ damno et *opprobrio* ansam præbuisse. Quis non merito irridet solennes istos Romæ pontificum ritus, quibus exercitantur, ut loqui amant, Dæmoniaci?—Verum istæ præstigiæ, quantumvis oculis et mentibus ignaræ plebis illudant; paulo tamen sagaciores non modo offendunt, sed revera ipsis nocent. Hi enim, dolo perspecto, ad impietatem proni ducuntur."—*Præf.* p. iv. † Luke x. 17.

INDEX.

A

Abimelech, account of him, ii. 151

Abraham, a brief historical view of the call of God to him and his family, ii. 62—by some authors taken for Zoroaster, 361—supposed by M. Fourmont to be Cronon, 402—the true meaning of the blessing pronounced on him, pointed out, iii. 138—exposition of the history of the command to sacrifice his son Isaac, 169–184—explanation of, "Our father Abraham wished to see my day," 172—summary of his history, 175, 308—the import of God's revelation to him explained, 177—in what sense said by Christ to have seen his day, 183, 189—reply to objections against the historical truth of his relation, 188—three distinct periods of his history pointed out, 189—an advocate for toleration, 269

Abraxas, (Egyptian amulet,) described, ii. 217

Academics and Pyrrhonians, their principles compared, i. 429

Academies, Greek, their founders and various sects, i. 429—on what principles erected, 432

Academy, Old, and Peripatetics, their conformity, i. 474

———, Old and New, their conformity, i. 475

Actions, signal instance of divine instruction conveyed by them in the case of Abraham, iii. 170—typical and significative distinguished, 198—their eloquence illustrated by an anecdote from the Spartan history, 299—and by another from the Roman history, 299

Adoption, account of the practice of, in ancient and modern times, i. 243

Adoration, Prideaux's account of the ancient form of, ii. 234

Æmilianus, character of, i. 290

Æneas, exposition of the story of his descent into hell, i. 235—inquiry into the nature of the poem of the Æneid, 235—the image of a perfect lawgiver conveyed in him, 239—personally alludes to Augustus, 246—description of his shield, 283

Æsculapius, observation on the ancient story and character of, i. 289

Africans, deductions from their knowledge of a future state, notwithstanding their barbarism, i. 311

Alcæus, why confounded with Hercules, ii. 257

Alexander the Great, the probable motive of his communicating to his mother the secrets of the Mysteries, i. 207—the stories of the exploits of Bacchus and Hercules in the Indies, designed to aggrandize him, ii. 256

Allegories, often imputed when never intended, i. 309—for what purpose introduced in the ancient Paganism, ii. 38—adopted by Christians in the interpretation of Scripture, 39—controversial reflections on their nature with reference to Job, and the ode of Horace, *O navis, referunt*, iii. 274—religious, distinguished, 201—argument deduced from the general passion for, 101

Alliance of Church and State, mutual inducements to enter into, i. 344—fundamental article in, 349

Alphabets, origin of, accounted for, ii. 183, 200—political, 201—sacred, 203—reason for discrediting the notion of their invention by the Israelites, 206—invention of, prior to the time of Moses, 207—Hebrew, formed by Moses from an improvement on the Egyptian, 207

America, remarks on the religion of the natives of, i. 169—the forests of, a good nursery for philosophers and Freethinkers, 378—remarks on the language of, ii. 388

Amos, a clear description of a particular providence quoted from the book of, ii. 501

Anatomy, practised and studied by the ancient Egyptians, ii. 163

Ancients, inquiry into their opinions concerning the immortality of the soul, i. 478

Animal food, Sir Isaac Newton's opinion of the introduction of it into Egypt refuted, ii. 286

——— *worship*, origin of, accounted for, ii. 33—true origin of, amongst the Egyptians, 223, 242—images of animals first worshipped, 225—afterwards the animals themselves, 226—various opinions of the ancients of its origin, 230

Anscharius, St., anecdote of, i. 401
Antichrist, laid open and exposed in the Revelation of St. John, iii. 429—the Pope, or church of Rome, is the Antichrist foretold in the scriptures, 431—circumstances which tended to bring the Protestants' views on this subject into disrepute, 432—the Papists themselves are obliged to own that the prophecies of St. John refer to the church of Rome, 434—difference of opinion between Protestants and Catholics on the antichristian power, 435—arguments to prove that Antichrist was not a civil power, but a spiritual, 441
Antoninus, emperor, motives on which he was desirous of initiation in the Eleusinian mysteries, i. 198—observations on his reflections on the Christians, 369—his reflections on death, 456—his notion of the human soul, 487
Apis, the symbol of the Egyptian god Osiris, ii. 225
Apollo, explanation of those oracles of his which were quoted by Eusebius from Porphyry, i. 212
———, Pythian, his oracles paralleled with the prophecies of scripture, by Middleton, iii. 204—Dr. Middleton's opinion exposed, 204
Apologue, or *Fable*, its use in oratory, ii. 187—its analogy to hieroglyphic writing, 188—its improvement and contraction in simile and metaphor, 189—its change to parable, 210
Apotheosis, civil, the origin of, i. 170—when bestowed on deceased heroes among the Egyptians, ii. 241
Apuleius, general intention of his Metamorphosis, i. 284—his personal character, 288—inquiry into his prejudices against Christianity, 290—his motives for defending paganism and mysteries, 293—foundation of his allegory of the Golden Ass, 294—story of his allegory of the Golden Ass, 295—moral of his story, 303—the corrupt state of the Mysteries in his time, 306
Arbitrary will, Zeno the patron of, i. 134
Areopagus, practice of that court, i. 82—remarks on the nature of that jurisdiction, 346—conjectures on the first founding of that court, 371
Argument, internal, defined, ii. 513
Aristophanes, review of the dispute between him and Socrates, i. 85
Aristotle, character of him and his philosophy, i. 454—his opinion of the human soul, 485—his distinction between mind and intellect, 486
Ark, the fatal effects of, amongst the Philistines, ii. 456
Arthur, king, and William the Conqueror, the similar outlines of their characters, ii. 252
Article VII. of the church of England, an exposition of, iii. 169—directed against the Manichean error, 169
Ar's, the inventors of, where placed in Elysium, by Virgil, i. 275
Ass carries mysteries, origin of that proverb, i. 248
Astronomy, Jewish, observations on, iii. 117
Atheism, examination of Bayle's arguments for, i. 129—an examination of Plutarch's account of the origin of, ii. 8—Plutarch's parallel between it and superstition, 8—lord Bacon's parallel between it and superstition, 20
Atheists, whether capable of distinguishing the moral difference of good and evil, i. 129—whether deserving of punishment from the hand of God, 142—the effect of his principles on his conduct compared with the fatalist, 149—their moral conduct accounted for, 150—summary of their dispute with the divines, 164—their opinion of the human soul, 479
Athenians, the most religious people of Greece, i. 196–200—copy of their test oath, 356—law relating to the introduction of foreign worship, 371—their behaviour in prosperity and adversity, iii. 104
Atomic theory, a Greek invention, i. 492, 510
Atossa, her invention of letters fabulous, ii. 386
Attributes, divine, examination of Lord Bolingbroke's notions of, i. 312
Augury of safety, Dion Cassius's account of, ii. 76
Aurelius, emperor, his opinion of the firmness of the Christians, ii. 111
Austin, St., his ingenious definition of language and letters, ii. 185
Author, the proper objects of his writings, i. 93
Authors, on the knowledge of old ones from the phrases they make use of, iii. 86—from the scenery introduced, 86

B

Bacchanalian rites, origin of the impieties committed in them, i. 226—representation of their vigils, 285—Plutarch's account of their vigils, 285—the Romans in their edicts against them careful not to violate the rights of toleration, 373
Bacchus, oath of the priestesses of, i. 356—his exploits in the Indies invented to aggrandize the glory of Alexander, ii. 256—his identity confounded with Osiris, 260—reasons for proving him to be Noah, 400

Bacon, Lord Chancellor, examination of his parallel between atheism and superstition, ii. 20
Balaam, his prophecy, Num. xxiv. 17, expounded, ii. 214 — observation on the story of his ass, 378—his wish to die the death of the righteous explained, iii. 140
Banishment, how far a punishment for offences committed against society, i. 118
Baptism, the importance of, established, iii. 74
Baucis and Philemon, whence that fable derived, i. 438
Bayle, his character as a writer, i. 128—examination of his arguments to prove atheism not destructive to society, 129—his reflections on toleration, ii. 431
Bembine Table, a description of it contained in Ezekiel's visions, ii. 308
Bennet, secretary, how brought into disgrace, i. 86
Bentley, the real existence of Zaleucus, and the authenticity of his remains, defended against him, i. 180
Bible, how differently represented by Freethinkers, i. 97—summary view of, iii. 11. See *Scriptures*.
Bolingbroke, lord, vindication of divines from his charge of confederating with atheists, i. 161—examination of some of the principles of his first philosophy, 312 — Montesquieu's letter respecting him, ii. 67—his observation on the insufficiency of the Mosaic law to restrain the people, answered, 457—consequences of a law upon his principles, 458—examination of his notion concerning the omission of the doctrine of a future state in the Mosaic dispensation, iii. 267
Bond, humorous anecdote of a forged one, i. 499
Brute worship, its symbolical nature explained, ii. 224—opinions of the ancients on the origin of it in Egypt, 230
Bryant, his opinion of the origin of human sacrifices exploded, iii. 449
Buffoonery, observation on the tendency of it, illustrated in the instances of Socrates and lord chancellor Hyde, i. 86, 87
Butler, ill effects resulting from his satire against fanaticism, i. 86

C

Cadmus, whence he obtained his alphabet, ii. 207
Cæsar, Julius, his disavowal of the belief of a future state in the senate, i. 426—his account of the religion of ancient Gaul, ii. 411—of ancient Germany, 412
Calf, golden, what divinity represented by it, ii. 303
Calves, of Dan and Bethel, why the Jews were so invincibly attached to them, ii. 305 — why two of them erected by Jeroboam, 308
Canaanites, why ordered to be exterminated, ii. 299
Canadians, remarks on their religion, i. 169
Cardan, his argument to prove the doctrine of the immortality of the soul destructive to society, i. 127
Casaubon, his account of the translation of the pagan mysteries into the Christian religion, ii. 234
Cato, mentioned in the Æneis, inquiry whether the Censor or of Utica, i. 284—his reply to Cæsar's disavowal of the belief of a future state in the senate, 426
Cavalry, the situations proper and improper for the use of, ii. 283
Caylus, count, his opinions relating to the Egyptian characters, ii. 373
Celsus, his character compared with that of Origen, i. 194 — his remark on Plato's doctrine of a future state, 453
Cerberus, in the Æneis, explained, i. 261
Ceres, Eleusinian, her temple described, i. 281—her story, 281
Cervantes, ill consequence resulting from his satire against knight-errantry, i. 85
Chaos, a description of, from Berosus, i. 257
Charlevoix, F., his sentiments respecting the civilisation of the North-American Indians, i. 406
Charon, exposition of the character of, in the Æneis, i. 260
Cheops, king of Egypt, how he raised money for the erection of his pyramids, explained, ii. 400
Children, the punishment of, for the crimes of their parents, on what principle only to be vindicated, ii. 98
Chinese language, an improvement of the ancient Egyptian hieroglyphics, ii. 178—improvement of, to its present state, 178—its opposite progress from that of the Egyptian hieroglyphical writing, to what owing, 180—to what the different accounts we have received of it are owing, 181—account of, by M. Freret, 181; by P. Parennin, 182; by M. Gaubil, 182; by P. Magaillans, 183—why not further improved, 184—hieroglyphical marks not for words, but things, 193—Du Halde's observations on, 216—the reverence of the natives for their ancient characters, 220—the ancient characters of, greatly venerated by the natives, 371
——— *printing*, Voltaire's account of, ii. 374

Christ, remarks on the use he made of his twofold credentials, scripture and miracles, iii. 174—made no use of traditions, 174—important argument drawn from his conversation with two disciples in their journey to Emmaus after his resurrection, 194—an exposition of his prophecy of his first and second coming, 208—the use to be made of miracles and prophecies in proof of his being the Messiah, 318—the light in which he was held by Pilate, 325—redemption by, had a retrospect from the fall, 365—an act of grace, not of debt, 366—the means employed in that great work inquired into, 368—his sacrifice on the cross considered, 380—the Socinian's opinion of the death of Christ examined, 390—his account of the last judgment examined, 401—the miracle of his resurrection considered, 411—his miracles of casting out devils or evil spirits, considered, 413—his miracles of healing natural diseases, considered, 415—his temptation considered, 416

Christian religion, how esteemed by the ancient Pagans, i. 291—how the evils of persecution arose in it, 366—first received with complacency by the pagans, 367—first incurred hatred by claiming to be the only true religion, 368—occasion of its being persecuted, 368—character of, by Tacitus, 368—persecuted both by good and bad princes, 402—the views and consequences of bringing in Pagan antiquity to assist in defending it, 508—their nocturnal assemblies vindicated from the misrepresentations of Dr. Taylor, chancellor of Lincoln, ii. 107—first occasion of the nocturnal assemblies of Christians, 113—Pliny's doubts of the manner of proceeding against the Christians, 116—an inquiry into the methods taken by Providence to propagate it, 322—the ignorance of the propagators, the means of advancing it, 322—its doctrine shadowed under the rites of the Mosaic law, iii. 76—its evidences, why not all disclosed by Providence, 195—and Judaism inseparable, 196—the ultimate end of Judaism, 202—its nature and genius explained, 323

Chronology, Egyptian, mistake of Sir Isaac Newton, illustrated by a case stated in similar circumstances, ii. 251

Church, its inducements for accepting an alliance with the state, i. 347—what it receives from the state, 350—what it communicates to the state, 351

Cicero, his opinion of the end of the law, i. 190—his exposition of the pagan theology, 208—his testimony in favour of the Eleusinian mysteries, 223—his reply to Cæsar's disavowment of a belief of a future state, in the senate, 426—his opinion of Academics, 430—his remark on the Phædo of Plato, 450—the difficulties in coming to the knowledge of his real sentiments of a future state of rewards and punishments, 458—the various characters he sustained in his life and writings, 460—where his true sentiments are to be expected, 462—his idea of the human soul, 462—his opinion of the obligation of an oath, under the belief of the immutability of the divine nature, 463—his account of the first advancer of the notion of τὸ ἕν, 493—accused by Lactantius of duplicity, ii. 69—remarks on Middleton's Life of, 75—his account of the origin of brute worship, controverted, 230

Circumcision, a patriarchal institution, ii. 313—why appointed, 334—when first enjoined, iii. 176

Citizen, how man ought to be educated to make a good one, i. 379

Claim of right and free gift, the difference, iii. 367

Clemens Alexandrinus, his account of a remarkable symbolical message sent to Darius, ii. 187—his account of the Egyptian characters and writing, compared with that of Porphyry, 191

Clerc, Le, his notions of the Pythagorean metempsychosis proved erroneous, i. 46—his opinion of the theocratic government of the Jews confuted, ii. 470

Clergy, abused by the Freethinkers, i. 87—the abuse of, an insult upon civil society, 90—the abuse of, an evidence of a weak cause, 91—vindicated against Lord Bolingbroke, 161—their hard luck amongst modern Freethinkers, 315

Collins, his ill treatment of his friend Locke, i. 88—inconsistencies in his writings, 95—the validity of his assertions, that new religions are always grafted on old ones, &c., examined into, ii. 440—characterized as a writer, iii. 199—an examination of his discourse on the grounds and reasons of the Christian religion, 199—his observations on the allegorical writings of the ancients, 232—these observations shown to refute his objections against Christianity, 293

Comets, their theory known by the ancient Egyptians, i. 491

Commentators on scripture, points recommended to their attention, iii. 149

Condamine, his remarks on the Indians of America, i. 378

Controversy, the arts of Freethinkers in, i. 80—the mischief arising from car-

rying it on under assumed characters, 94—when this practice may be justifiable, 94
Cretans, celebrate their Mysteries openly, i. 221—boast of Jupiter and other gods being born amongst them, 221—the custom of adopting youth among, 243
Critias of Athens, some account of, and a translation of his iambics, ii. 3
Crocodile, why worshipped by the Egyptians, ii. 224
Cromwell, his character contrasted with those of his associates, Fleetwood, Lambert, and Vane, ii. 24
Cudworth, his testimony as to the ancient opinion of the soul's immortality, i. 480—corrected as to his observation on Plutarch, 488—the history of his Intellectual System, ii. 106
Cupid and Psyche, exposition of the fable of, i. 305
Custom, remarkable instance from antiquity, of its power to erase the strongest impressions of nature, i. 143
Customs, a similarity of, observable among distant nations, no argument of an actual communication between them, ii. 372—traductive, an inquiry into, 359

D

Dacier, his notion of the Pythagorean metempsychosis erroneous, i. 445
Darius, Cyrus's dream respecting him, ii. 221
Dark sayings, what that expression imports in scripture, ii. 211
David, why appointed to succeed Saul, ii. 319—his title of "man after God's own heart," explained, 320—the chronology of facts relating to his introduction to Saul, rectified, 407
Dead men, origin of the worship of, traced, ii. 27
Death, citations from the Stoics, showing their notions concerning it, i. 456
Debtors, ancient and modern treatment of, compared, i. 260—funeral rites denied to the ancient, whilst the modern are buried alive, i. 260
Dedication, of the second edition of Books i. ii. iii. of the Divine Legation, to the Earl of Hardwicke, i. 76—to the Freethinkers, 77—of Books iv. v. vi. to Lord Mansfield, ii. 84—of Books iv. v. vi. to the Jews, 93
Dedications, absurdity of addressing them unsuitably, i. 77
Deification, when bestowed on any hero of the Egyptians, ii. 238
Deities, pagan, whence derived, ii. 35—form of the ancient statues of, accounted for, 35—their spurious offspring accounted for, 274—local and tutelary, their worship always maintained even by sojourners and conquerors, 447
Democritus and Epicurus, their doctrine of matter compared, ii. 78
Demoniacs, the miracles of casting out devils or evil spirits, considered, iii. 413—various opinions concerning them, examined, 471
Demons, whence the doctrine of the Pythagoreans and Platonists so full of, i. 475—Apuleius's account of, 476
Des Cartes, not the inventor of the atomic philosophy, i. 492, 510
Devoted, the command that "none devoted shall be redeemed," examined, iii. 454
Diagoras, consequence of his revealing the Orpheic and Eleusinian mysteries, i. 219
Dido, remarks on her character in the Æneis, i. 240
Dionysius Halicarnasseus, his distinction between established and tolerated religions among the ancients, i. 374
Drama, its obligation to conform to nature in the delineation of characters, ii. 82
Dramatic writing, remarks on, with reference to the book of Job, iii. 81–84
Dreams, Artemidorus's division of, into speculative and allegorical, ii. 220—superstitious interpretation of, 220—grounds of this species of divination, 221

E

Earthquakes, said by Pythagoras to be occasioned by a synod of ghosts, i. 424—predicted by the taste of well-water, 424—on the predicting of, ii. 70
Egypt, the Mysteries first instituted there, i. 231—by whom carried abroad, 232—a religious war in, and the occasion of it, 362—original of animal worship in, 363—the place whence the Grecian legislators, naturalists, and philosophers derived their knowledge, 422—an inquiry into the state of the learning and superstition of, in the time of Moses, ii. 145—why entitled to priority among civilized nations, 150—scripture account of, 151—the antiquity and power of, as delivered in the Grecian writers, confirmed by scripture, 153—civil arts of, 157—a critical inquiry into the military usages of, at the time of the Trojan war, 279—abounding in horses before the conquest of Libya, 280—why the Israelites were prohibited carrying horses from, 281—the laws of Moses, why accommodated to the prejudices of the Jews, in favour of, 310—the ancient school of legislation,

352—fundamental maxims in the religious policy of, 353—hereditary despotism preferred there, 354—the government not rendered despotic by Joseph, 365

Egyptian characters, Kircher and Count Caylus, their opinions concerning, 196, 378

——— *heroes*, the reason why the later obtained the names of their earlier gods, explained, ii. 253

——— *hieroglyphics*, how they came to be, and to conceal their learning, ii. 190—curiological and tropical, 194—symbolic, 196—their change of their style effected by this latter application of them, 196

Egyptian husbandry, anecdote of, i. 98

——— *idolatry*, described in Ezekiel's visions, ii. 306

——— *learning*, that mentioned in scripture, and that mentioned in a corresponding manner by the Greek writers, the same, ii. 149—no distinct division of the sciences in, 163—how preserved from the knowledge of the people by the priests, 209—summary of, 218

——— *physicians*, confined to distinct branches of the medical art, ii. 157, 161—their preventive method of practice, 158 — their number accounted for, 158—proved to compose an order of the priesthood, 164

——— *priesthood*, account of, from Diodorus Siculus, ii. 153—confirmed by Moses, 154—their rites, 156

——— *writing*, the four kinds of, ii. 191

Egyptians, a people most celebrated for the cultivation of religion, i. 168—celebrated for religion in the most early times; their priests, also their judges and magistrates, 420—examination into the degree of their scientific knowledge, 491—in what their wisdom more especially consisted, 492—among the first who taught the immortality of the soul, 495—why subject to incurable diseases, ii. 160—their funeral rites, 170—their sacred dialect, 209—origin of animal worship among, 223—worshippers of plants, 223—of chimerical beings, 224—local animal deities among, 224—their charge against the Grecians of stealing their gods, with their mutual recriminations, 196

Eleusinian Mysteries, the general purpose of their institution, i. 196—requisites for initiation into them, 197 — initiation into, deemed as necessary among the pagans, as baptism among Christians, 199—why kept secret, 200—the greater and the less, 201—inquiry into the doctrines taught in the greater, 202; negatively, 202; positively, 203—why aspired to, by considerable personages, 205—a detection of polytheism, 205—why the unity of Deity concealed in them, 206—the history narrated in them, what, 216—the hymn sung at, 217—how they became corrupted, 225—why abused by the fathers, 228—under the inspection of the civil magistrate, 229—transferred into the Christian religion, 230—of the Egyptians and Grecians, the same, 231 — where invented, 232 — by whom, 232—offices in the celebration of, 232—taught a future state of rewards and punishments, 235—initiation into, represented by poets allegorically by descent into hell, 245—initiation into, compared with death, 278—alluded to by Solomon, in Ecclus. iv. 17, 18, 278—the celebration of, a drama of the history of Ceres, 281—the rites of, contained in the Golden Ass of Apuleius, 300—magic rites in the corrupt state of, 306

Elias, the sense in which he was predicted to come before the day of the Messiah, ascertained, iii. 221

Elihu, why distinguished from the other friends of Job, iii. 118—his character, 120

Elijah, the difference of the account of his translation and Enoch's accounted for, iii. 4

Elisha, exposition of the adventure between him and Joash, iii. 312

Eloquence, defined by Milton, ii. 84

Elysium, the description of, in Virgil, preferred to that in Homer, i. 74—the several stations allotted to the happy by Virgil, i. 275

Embalming, the Egyptian method of, ii. 161, 170—this operation performed by the physicians, and the reason, 162—the antiquity of the general practice of, proved, 171

Enigmas, required in the nature of God's dispensation to the Jews, ii. 211

Enoch, the difference between the account of his translation and that of Elijah accounted for, iii. 4

Enthusiasm and fraud, the union of, accounted for, ii. 23

Epic poetry, Homer, Virgil, and Milton, the triumvirate of, i. 245

Epictetus, his notion of death, i. 456

Epicurus, his doctrine of matter compared with that of Democritus, ii. 79

Epistolic writing, account of the origin of, ii. 200

Error, ridicule the proper means of detecting, i. 102

Essential differences, Aristotle the patron of, i. 134

Establishments in religion, advantages of, ii. 89

Eucharistical sacrifice, origin and nature of, explained, iii. 371
Euhemerus, how subjected to the imputation of atheism, i. 220—examination of his conduct in disclosing the secrets of the mysteries, ii. 37
Evander, observation on Virgil's account of his court, i. 242
Eve, the creation of, inquired into, iii. 340
Evremond, St., examination of his remarks on the characters in the Æneis, i. 239
Exodus, iii. 14, and vi. 3, expounded, ii. 300
Expiatory sacrifice, origin and nature of it explained, iii. 372
Ezekiel, and Jeremiah, the actions recorded to be performed by them to illustrate their prophecies accounted for, ii. 185—his famous visions, chap. viii. relating to the Jewish idolatry, expounded, 306—God's reproaches to the Jews for their perverseness and disobedience, delivered by him, 335—the celebrated prophecy in his 20th chapter explained, 338—his representation of the Jewish idolatry, 452, 454—quotations from, in confirmation of a particular providence, 501 — a passage in, predictive of the new dispensation, iii. 5—his vision of the dry bones explained, 129
Ezra, his writings pointed out, iii. 123—supposed to be the writer of the book of Job, 122, 271; also the books of Chronicles and Esther, 123—by tradition among the Jews, the same person as Malachi, 123—inquiry who he was, 271

F

Fables, ancient, an inquiry into the origin of, i. 436
Faith, summary view of the disputes concerning it and morality, ii. 79—defined from St. Paul, iii. 158—the condition of the new covenant, considered, 394—St. Paul's and St. James's accounts reconciled, 399
Fall, inquired into, iii. 355
Falsely condemned, their being assigned to purgatory accounted for, i. 265
Fanaticism, ill effect resulting from Butler's satire against it, i. 85
Fatalists, the influence of the principles on the conduct of, compared with that of the atheists, i. 49
Fathers, Christian, inquiry into their sentiments of the human soul, i. 482
Fiction, from what motive employed by the ancient lawgivers, ii. 413
Figurative expressions; origin of, ii. 212—215
First philosophy, according to Lord Bolingbroke, i. 312 — according to Sancho Panca, 314
Fleetwood, General, his character, ii. 25
Foot, its import in the Old-Testament language, iii. 104
Forfeitures, remarks on the laws of, in cases of high treason, iii. 8
Forgery, marks of, in ancient writings, i. 182—opposed to forgery by the primitive apologists for Christianity, 499
Foster, his notions of the Jewish Theocracy, examined, ii. 436
Fourmont, M., his mistake of the identity of Abraham with Cronos corrected, ii. 402
Fraud, opposed to fraud by the primitive apologists, i. 498—and enthusiasm, the union of, accounted for, ii. 23
Free gift and claim of right, the difference between, iii. 367
Freethinkers, proper estimation of that character, i. 78—their complaints of the want of liberty ill founded, 79—their principal abuses of liberty pointed out, 80—in classic times would have been styled enemies to their country, 87—their abuse of the clergy, 87—this abuse the evidence of a weak cause, 91 their professions and their practice compared, 92—the multifarious characters they assume, 94—both dogmatists and sceptics, 96
Funeral rites, the great attention paid to them by the ancients, i. 258—of the Egyptians, described from Herodotus, ii. 170
Future state of rewards and punishments, the doctrine of, necessary to the well-being of civil society, i. 112, 123—the importance of the doctrine of, to the well-being of civil society, believed by all the wisest part of mankind, 165—how taught in the mysteries, 196—the ancient legislators unanimous in propagating the belief of, 376—the sages as unanimous in propagating the belief of, 376—the sages as unanimous in thinking the doctrine of, necessary to the well-being of society, 407 — Lord Shaftesbury's opinion of, 411—sentiments of theistical philosophers on, 412—sentiments of antiquity on the use of, to society, 413—Cæsar's disbelief of, with Cato and Cicero's answers to him, 426—of all the ancient Greek philosophers, only believed by Socrates, 429—from what causes disbelieved by the ancient Greek philosophers, 467—considered as a moral designation, as necessarily implying punishments as rewards, 472—its being disbelieved by the wisest of the ancients, no discredit to the Christian doctrine of, 507—not of the number of those doctrines taught by natural religion, 508—the benefits of

that doctrine to the Gentile world, ii. 55 — supplied to the Jews by an extraordinary providence, 55 — no part of the Mosaic dispensation, iii. 1—purposely omitted in the Mosaic dispensation, 3—the want of, how supplied, 4—strongly inculcated by the Suevi and Arabs, 13—positive declarations against the expectation of, instanced from the Jewish writers, 13—corroborated by the New-Testament writers, 18—examination of Lord Bolingbroke's notion on the omission of that doctrine in the Mosaic dispensation, 28—the doctrine of, deducible by natural reasons, 40—a review of the prejudices which have induced to the belief that it was taught in the Mosaic dispensation, 73—that taught by natural religion to be distinguished from that taught by the Christian revelation, 74—its mention by Moses and by succeeding writers to be distinguished, 77 — a review of those passages in scripture urged to prove that it was taught in the Mosaic dispensation, 131 — a list of texts urged by the rabbins in proof of its being taught under the Mosaic law, 150—an examination of the arguments founded on the 11th chapter of the Hebrews to show that it was taught by Moses, 158—that it was not taught in the Mosaic law, confirmed by the authorities of Grotius, Episcopius, Arnaud, and Bishop Bull, 167—Dr. Rutherforth's opinion, of Moses not being studious to conceal this doctrine, examined, 291—not contained in the Mosaic dispensation, 240—this omission a proof of its divine origin, 240—brought to light by the gospel alone, 338—the origin and progress of that opinion inquired into, 351—a free gift, not a claim of right, 367

G

Gathered to the people, that phrase explained, iii. 133

Gaul, ancient, inquiry into the deities of, ii. 263

Geometry, on the origin of, ii. 288

Germany, ancient, Cæsar's account of the gods of, ii. 399

Glycho, account of the Mysteries of, i. 282

God, note on the various opinions of the human nature of, i. 380—examination of Lord Bolingbroke's notions of the divine attributes, 312—the disbelief of a future state of rewards and punishments founded by the Greek philosophers on his immutability, 468—whether endowed with human passions, 470—the distinction made by philosophers between the *good* and the *just*, 471—a censure of those who estimate his decrees by the standard of their own ideas, ii. 56—the only means of preserving the doctrine of his unity, 419

God of Israel, why he gave himself a name to the Jews, ii. 299—the relation in which he stood to the Jewish people, 433—why represented with human affections, 435—not less benign to man under the law, than under the gospel, 435—how considered by the neighbouring nations, 339—his character as the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, explained, and the mistakes concerning this text pointed out, iii. 151

Gods of the pagans, bad consequences of the vicious examples of, i. 204—who they were, explained, 205—three systems concerning, 206—the fear of, amongst the Romans, 408—the necessity of a fear of, to society, 411—how so many immoralities came to be recorded of them, ii. 239—account of the origin of local tutelary ones in Greece, from Plato, 261

Golden Ass of Apuleius, the moral of, i. 252—the foundation of that allegory, 294—the story of, 295

——— *bough*, in the Æneis, meaning of, i. 251

——— *calf*, account of it omitted by Josephus, iii. 58

Good, natural, requires human industry to prepare and apply it, i. 340

Gospel, the moral precepts of, the same with those of natural religion, i. 159—no justification by works under, iii. 164—its nature and genius considered, 339

Grace, inquiry into the system of, iii. 329

Grecian history, the accounts of Greek historians no otherwise to be credited than as corroborated by scripture, ii. 149—an inquiry into the validity of their testimony concerning the antiquity of the Egyptian monarchy, 150—the confused chronology of the early part of, remarked, 250

Greece, when dead men first began to be deified there, i. 171—the learning of, derived from Egypt, 422—much given to speculative legislation, 422—remarks on the species of philosophy cultivated there, 423—the religion of, traced down to its original, ii. 260—what it borrowed from Egypt, 262—the three distinguished periods in the religion of, 271—charged by the Egyptians with stealing their gods, 273—ignorant of the use of cavalry at the time of the Trojan war, 279

Greek philosophy, a twofold doctrine taught in, external and internal, i. 416—account of, from Macrobius, 418—progress of, 422

Greenland women, their language a refinement on that of the men, ii. 385
Grey, Dr., his notions concerning the book of Job controverted, iii. 93—examination of his objections to the author of the Divine Legation's account of the book of Job, 279
Grotius, his fatal misinterpretations of the Jewish prophecies shown, iii. 230

H

Hades, its different senses in the Old and New Testaments pointed out, iii. 68
Hagar, why she named the angel who appeared to her Elroi, ii. 299
Halde, Du, his remarks on the style of the Chinese language, ii. 216
Happiness, the pursuit of, not the obligation to morality, i. 138
Hare, Bishop, his tract on the difficulties and discouragements which attend the study of the scriptures misunderstood, i. 79—character of him, ii. 108—his censure of Josephus, 497
Hebrew, the uncertainty of that language, iii. 271
——— *alphabet*, whence derived, ii. 207—when the points were added to it, 208
Hebrews, the argument of St. Paul's Epistle to, stated, ii. 159
Hecate of the Greeks, account of, i. 258
Heliopolis, the most famous college of the ancient Egyptian priests, ii. 154—the worship established there, 155
Hell, its different meanings in the Old and in the New Testament, iii. 144
Hercules, story of his interview with Jupiter, ii. 228—the ancient Egyptian account why there were so many of that name, 253
Heresies, Tertullian's account of the origin of, i. 502
Hermes Trismegistus, history of the books forged in the name of, i. 497
Hero-worship, the origin of, traced, ii. 32—complicated in its rites, 32—source of the low date of, 271
Herod, the cause of his supposing Jesus to be John the Baptist risen from the dead, explained, iii. 397
Herodotus, his opinion of the origin of geometry, ii. 288
Heroes, lives of, compared, ii. 251
——— *of antiquity*, their characters compounded of enthusiasm and craft, ii. 22
Hetæriæ, (assemblies of the primitive Christians,) the nature of, explained; when and by whom suppressed, ii. 132
Hezekiah, the name he gave to the brasen serpent accounted for, ii. 402—detail of God's dealing with him, iii. 89
Hieroglyphics, the first essay towards the art of writing, ii. 173—found in use amongst the Mexicans by the Spaniards, 173—found in Siberia, 175—this picturesque method of expression abridged by the Egyptians, 175—brief view of their types and allusions, 175—mythologic account of the origin of, 177—improved in the Chinese language, 177—source of the different genius of, from the Chinese characters, 180—stood for things, and not for sounds, 183, 225—used by all nations, 183—how they came to be applied by the Egyptians to conceal their learning, 190—their influence on language, 216—the origin of brute-worship, 223, 225—on the origin and progress of, iii. 300
Hierophant of the mysteries, his office, ii. 229
Hippocrates, his opinion of the Cnidian Sentences, ii. 166—deductions from, as to the ancient practice of physic, 166—author of the diætetic part of medicine, 169
Holy Spirit, inquiry into the nature, office, and operations of the, iii. 317
Homer, excelled by Virgil in the description of Elysium, i. 274—his representations of the ancient Greek physicians ascertained and accounted for, ii. 164—whence he collected his materials, 400
Hooker, his sentiments of the practical use of religion, ii. 48—his censure of those who estimate the dispensations of Providence by the test of their own conceptions, 56
Horace, the double sense in his famous ode, *O navis, referent, &c.*, pointed out, iii. 216
Horeb, consequences of the contract there between God and the Jewish people, ii. 433
Horses, not in use at the Trojan war, ii. 279—Egypt abounded with, before the conquest of Libya, 280—Israelites forbid to fetch horses from Egypt, 281—motives for the prohibition, 281—Solomon's violation of the law punished, 282—Judea not a proper country for the use or breeding of, 283
Hosea, his representation of the Jewish idolatry, ii. 453
Huet, his conjectures of the corruption of sacred history into Pagan fables, i. 438
Human sacrifices, the origin of, inquired into, iii. 379—Bryant's opinion of the origin of, exploded, 449—Voltaire's opinion confuted, 451—the command that "none devoted shall be redeemed," examined, 454
Hyde, Lord Chancellor, how brought into disgrace, i. 86
Hymn, that sung by the Hierophants at the celebration of the Eleusinian Mysteries, pointed out, i. 217

I

Iapis, his character in Virgil not designed for Antonius Musa, i. 287
Idolaters, the first intolerants, iii. 269
Idolatry, account of the rise of the three species of, from Sanchoniatho, i. 212—the progress of, traced, ii. 28—inquiry where idolatry was punished, except under the Jewish economy, iii. 267
——— *of the Assyrians*, transplanted into the Holy Land in the room of the captive Jews, how punished, ii. 448—view of the early spread of, by Calmet, iii. 51
———, Jewish, under what figures represented in the prophecies, ii. 403—the extent of that crime, and how legally punishable under the Jewish theocracy, 434—never proceeding from matters of conscience, 434—the sources of, pointed out, 447—in what it consisted, 449–454
Ignatius Loyola, remarks on his character, ii. 5
Increase and multiply, that command considered, iii. 342
Infanticide, remarks on the custom of, among the ancients, &c., i. 264—on the practice of, 396—the origin and practice of, examined, iii. 379—the origin and progress of, considered, 452
Infants, and men falsely condemned, why consigned by Virgil to purgatory, i. 263
Infernal regions, a comment on Virgil's topography of, i. 262
Infidelity, propensity of the present age to, i. 78—an indiscriminate aversion to all the principles advanced by, ii. 145—prejudicial to the defence of true religion, 146—the proper method of disputing with, 146
Instinct in mankind, how different from that quality in brutes, i. 142
Invocation of the dead, inquiry concerning, iii. 292
Irony, ill consequences of the indiscriminate use of it, i. 92
Isaiah, his denunciations against the Israelites for bringing horses from Egypt, in violation of the Mosaic prohibition, ii. 282—his representation of the Jewish idolatry, 451, 452—double senses, in his prophecies, explained, iii. 222—his figurative prediction of the gospel dispensation, 227
Isiac Table. See *Bembine Table*.
Isis, who, i. 299—why adopted by the Athenians as the patroness of their Mysteries, ii. 267—the several attributes and characters ascribed to her, 268—the cause of her being worshipped under the figure of a galley, 366
Isis and Osiris, under what similitudes worshipped, ii. 157—the patrons of the primitive arts, 278—their Mysteries described in Ezekiel's visions, 307
Israelites, why subject to few natural diseases, ii. 161—forbid by their law to fetch horses from Egypt, 281—this law violated by Solomon, and punished, 282—treated by God as moral agents, 324—Fleury's account of the state of the arts among, in the time of Moses, 388

J

Jablonski, notes on a passage in, contending that the Egyptian gods were not dead men deified, i. 382
Jacob, his expressions to Pharaoh, Gen. xlvii. 9, explained, iii. 139—his ejaculation to his sons, Gen. xlix. 18, explained, 140—his wrestling with an angel, what intended by, 185—shown to be of a tolerating disposition, 269
Jamblichus, note on a passage of, i. 381—his opinion of the ancient Mysteries, 310—his account of the origin of brute worship controverted, ii. 233
James, his and St. Paul's account of justification by faith reconciled, iii. 399
Jehovah, explanation of that name, ii. 300
Jephthah, the story of his vow considered, iii. 456
Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, the signs added by them to illustrate their prophecies, accounted for, ii. 185—his representation of the Jewish idolatry, 451—a passage in, predictive of the new dispensation, iii. 5—passages quoted from, predictive of the new dispensation, 228
Jerusalem, the destruction of, as prophesied by Christ figuratively, in a literal sense importing the destruction of the world, iii. 208
Jews, how differently represented by Freethinkers, i. 96—their religion, dogmatic theology, 365—why they became hated by their neighbours, 366—character of, by Tacitus, 368—how long they continued ignorant of a future state, ii. 56—their religion syllogistically proved to be supported by an extraordinary providence, 57—a summary view of their religious history, 62—observations on their ritual or ceremonial law, 62—on the change of dispensation, prophesied by Jeremiah and other prophets, 62—dedication of books iv. v. vi. to them, 93—an examination into the motives which withhold them from receiving Christianity, 95—arguments adapted to invalidate them, 96—the subject of their naturalization argued, 100—the repeal of the Naturalization Bill justified, 102

—the folly of deriving all arts, laws, and religion from them, or denying them the production of any, 147—fond of Egyptian manners and superstitions, 298—their obstinate attachment to the Egyptian customs and superstitions historically traced, 302—their expulsion from Egypt by Pharaoh denied, 304—reproached in a signal manner for their perverseness and disobedience, Ezekiel xx., 335—explanation of this celebrated chapter, 337—their propensity to idolatry accounted for, 352—under what figures their idolatry was represented, 403—why their policy was seldom understood, 418—in what light their separation from the rest of mankind is to be considered, 419—summary view of deliverance from Egypt in order to be separated, 429—their theocracy established, 430—their idolatry, not a rejection of the God of Israel, 450—how long their theocratic form of government subsisted, 468—their first kings the viceroys of God, 463—when their theocratic government was abolished, 476—at the coming of the Messiah, 477—their ignorance of a future state under the Mosaic dispensation illustrated by the New-Testament writers, iii. 18—whether subject to punishment in a future state under the Mosaic dispensation, 41—how long they continued ignorant of a future state, 68—whence their obstinate adherence to their abolished rites proceeds, 75—their history supposed to be contained in the history of Job, 93—a summary view of their history, 95—the bad consequence of their propensity toward marrying idolatrous women, 105—reflections on the moral dispensations of God toward them, 114—totally ignorant of a future state under the Mosaic dispensation, 250, 258

Job, book of, a critical inquiry into, iii. 78—a dramatic composition, 79—when written, 84, 93, 94—observations on the imagery of, 86—a continual allusion to the Mosaic law throughout, 91—the language of, compared to that of the American Indians, 93—the purpose of its composition pointed out, 97—examination of the characters in the piece, 98, 108, 118—supposed to contain the history of the Jews, 99—allegory of the story explained, 99—reflections on the character of Satan, 112—inquiry concerning the author, 122—supposed to have been written by Ezra, 122—inquiry whether "I know that my Redeemer liveth," &c., refers to a resurrection, or temporal deliverance only, 123—examination of Grey's objections to the author of the Divine Legation account of the, 279—inquiry into the antiquity of, 288—appendix concerning the, 267

Job, his real existence asserted, iii. 83—his exemplary patience not founded on his written story, 98—reflections on the character of his wife, 103—reflections on the character of his friends, 108, 118—his persecution renewed by modern critics, 273—inquiry whether he put away his wife, 288—his opinion of providence inquired into, 289

Joel, the double senses in his prophecy pointed out, iii. 206, 209

John the Baptist, his mission and character explained, iii. 396

Joseph, prime minister of Egypt, married to a daughter of the priest of On, ii. 155—vindicated from the charge of rendering the government of Egypt despotic, 172—inference drawn from his entertainment of his brethren, concerning the use of animal food in Egypt, 286—procures the property of all the land for Pharaoh, 287—did not make the government of Egypt despotic, 335—an eminent instance of the strength of natural affection, iii. 81

Josephus, his character of the Jewish religion, with a reference to the pagan Mysteries, i. 211—defended from the charge of disbelieving the miracles he relates, ii. 493—the circumstances under which he wrote his history, 494—his deviations from scripture accounted for, 495

Joshua, clear state of the debate between him and the Jewish people on the article of worship, ii. 450

Jotham's parables, an instance of instruction by apologue or fable, ii. 188—observations on the story of, 378

Judaism, its characteristic distinction from all other religions, ii. 141

Judea, not a proper country for the use of cavalry in, ii. 283—Voltaire's account of, examined, 425

Judgment, Christ's account of it examined, iii. 401

——— *of Hercules*, an allegoric piece to excite the youth of Greece to virtue, iii. 286

Julian, emperor, his observations on the double doctrines of the Greek philosophers, i. 454—the miracle of his being defeated in his attempt to rebuild the temple, considered, iii. 419

Jupiter, only one deity, though known by many local tutelar appellations, i. 397—a local deity, ii. 142—the stories of his adulteries founded in truth, 240

——— *Ammon*, moral of the Egyptian fable concerning, i. 194

Justice, the pure stream of, in England, ii. 191

Justification by faith, explained, iii. 394 —St. Paul's and St. James's accounts reconciled, 399

K

Kings of the Jews, the viceroys of God, ii. 463

Kircher, characterized as a writer, ii. 244 — his opinion concerning the Egyptian characters, 196, 372, 390

L

Lactantius, an examination of the argument of his treatise *De Ira Dei*, i. 470

Lamb, paschal, a type of the future sacrifice of Christ, iii. 198, 200

Lambert, his character, ii. 25

Language, a deduction of the origin of, ii. 185—upheld at first by a mixture of words and signs, 185—its improvement by apologue or fable, 187—its advance to elegance by the metaphor, 189—the revolutions of, traced, 210—Diodorus Siculus's account of the origin of, 375—first taught by God, 375

Law, the two great sanctions of, i. 117 ——, Mosaic, the objections brought against the sufficiency of it in obtaining its end, equally valid against the law of nature, ii. 457—its provision against idolatry, 460—cause of its inefficacy, 461—its divine institution manifest in the dispensations of providence toward the Jewish people, 465 —the primary intention of, 465—the temporal sanctions of, not transferred into the gospel, 508 — illustrations from the prophets of the temporal nature of its sanctions, iii. 1 — the Christian doctrine shadowed under the rites of, 76—in what sense typical or spiritual, 134—not supposed by St. Paul to offer a future state to its followers, 164

Lawgiver, heroic, displayed in the character of Æneas, i. 239—from what motive induced to have recourse to fiction, ii. 413

Lawgivers, summary view of their conduct in the propagation of religion, iii. 244

Laws, penal, to enforce opinions, only equitable under a theocracy, ii. 431

Lazarus, passages in the parable of, explained, with reference to arguments founded on them of a future state being taught by Moses, iii. 154

Legislation, ancient, a divine interposition the very spirit of, i. 237

Legislators, and their pretended missions, an enumeration of, i. 174 — an inquiry into their motives, 176—placed by Virgil in Elysium, 275—however different from each other in other points, unanimous in propagating the belief of a future state of rewards and punishments, 376—compared with modern missionaries, 379 —always enthusiasts, ii. 22 — never found a people without religion, 47

Letters, whether entitled to patronage of the great, i. 107—the history of, ii. 173 — the antiquity of, among the Egyptians, inferred from their mythologic derivation of them, 206 — the invention of, by Atossa, fabulous, 387

Lex sacra, what, i. 394

Liberty, civil, too great an attention to the security of, subversive of religion, ii. 85

Life, the promises of, under the Mosaic law, how to be understood, iii. 141–146

Livy, his character of Scipio Africanus, ii. 83

Locke, Mr., his memory injured by his friend Collins, i. 88—his last word to Collins, 89—his observations on the Jewish theocracy, ii. 432

Lord's supper, the antitype of the paschal lamb, iii. 384—the institution of, examined from St. Paul's sense of it, 387—Bossuet's objections to the Protestants' opinion of the figure of "This is my body," by those of "I am the vine, I am the door," examined, 468

Lot, his story supposed to be allegorized by Ovid in Baucis and Philemon, i. 438

Love, Plato's account of the origin of, iii. 341

Lucian, his opinion of death, i. 457— his account of the origin of brute-worship controverted, ii. 231

Lucius, story of his transformation, from the Golden Ass of Apuleius, i. 295

Luxury, observations on the vague meaning of that word, i. 157—true definition of, 159

Lycanthropy, a Grecian disorder, account of, i. 439

Lycurgus, his chief aim in the laws of Sparta, ii. 355

Lyte, anecdote relating to his conjectural notes touching the origin of the university of Oxon, &c., ii. 79

M

Macrobius, his account of the doctrines of Greek philosophers, i. 418

Magistrates, civil, their inducement to an alliance with the church, i. 344— two conclusions drawn by believers and unbelievers, from the large share of magistrates in the establishment of ancient national religions, ii. 4

Mahomet, the absurdity of his imitating Moses in the distinction of meats, pointed out, ii. 327—his imitation of Moses in the union of civil and religious policy, 433—the plan on which his religion was framed, 445, 467—to

what his successes were chiefly owing, 513
Mahometan writers, a character of, ii. 442
Man, how determined to action, i. 148—in society described, 153—an inquiry into the moral constitution of, as an individual, and in society, 318
Man and woman, examination of the Mosaic account of, iii. 340—examination of the command to increase and multiply, 342 — Mosaic account of their specific nature examined, iii. 344—their admission into paradise, 346—their first religion acquired naturally, 346—their early acquisition of speech, 347—religion revealed to them in paradise, 348—their condition under natural religion inquired into, 349—their condition under revealed religion inquired into, 354
Manasseh, detail of God's dealings with him, iii. 90
Mandeville, examination of his principle of private vices being public benefits, i. 156—his arguments reduced to an absurdity, 159
Manicheans, Art. VII. of the Church of England directed against them, iii. 169
Mansfield, Lord, dedication of books iv. v. vi. to him, ii. 84
Mead, Dr., his opinion of demoniacs examined, iii. 472
Medicine, the parts of, and when each obtained in use, ii. 168—indication of the great antiquity of, 168
Melchizedec, observations on the story of, iii. 269
Metempsychosis, why taught in the Mysteries, i. 277—the doctrine of, how employed by the ancients, 439—and metamorphoses, difference between, 439—Pythagorean notion of, 444—came originally from Egypt, and believed by all mankind, 445—Plato's notion of, 451—the doctrine of, not the origin of brute-worship, ii. 231
Mexicans, remarks on the religion of, i. 169—their use of hieroglyphic writing illustrated by their manner of painting their prayers, ii. 173—account of a Mexican history in the hieroglyphic style, 174
Mhhokek, the proper signification of that word pointed out, ii. 477
Middleton, remarks on his Life of Cicero, ii. 75—his arguments of the derivation of popish from pagan rites examined, 415 — his opinion of the gift of tongues exposed, iii. 470
Milesian fables, what, i. 294
Milton, remarks on the species of poetry in his Paradise Lost, i. 245
Mind and intellect, the Aristotelian distinction, i. 486
Minerva, exposition of a famous hieroglyphical inscription on her temple at Sais, ii. 195
Miracles, evidences of an extraordinary providence over the Jewish nation, ii. 493, 499—a necessary confirmation of the secondary senses of the Jewish prophecies, iii. 219—the use to be made of them in disputes, 317—the testimony required for the belief of, 406–421—what to be accounted miracles, 407—the only proof of a doctrine proceeding from God, 409 — of the resurrection of Christ considered, 411—of casting out devils, or evil spirits, considered, 413—of healing natural diseases considered, 415—intended to defeat the designs of impious men considered, 418
Mirth, an enemy to chastity, i. 296
Missionaries, Catholic and Protestant, reasons of the ill success of their missions, i. 376—compared with ancient lawgivers, 379
Missions, pretended by ancient legislators, list of, i. 174
Molech, the meaning of giving seed to him, iii. 144
Montesquieu, extract of a letter from, to the author, ii. 67
Moon, its various symbols and attributes, as represented in the pagan mythology from the Golden Ass of Apuleius, i. 299
Moral sense, the foundation of, i. 130—Plato the patron of, 134
Morality and faith, summary view of the disputes concerning, ii. 79
Mosaic dispensation, not a complete religion, ii. 55—logically proved to be supported by an extraordinary providence, 57 — on what principles the proof of it conducted, 58—its limitation to a particular people, no impeachment of the impartiality of God towards mankind in general, 61—summary estimate of, 62 — its divinity logically proved, iii. 241, 255
——— *ritual*, the cause of the admission of sacrifices into it, considered, iii. 378
——— *sacrifices*, had types and also a moral import, iii. 377
Moses, a list of pagan gods and heroes, supposed by Huet to have arisen from the corruption of his history, i. 438—his account of the Egyptian priesthood, a confirmation of those of the ancient Greek historians, ii. 154—corroborates their account of the religious rites of Egypt, 156 — of the funeral rites of Egypt, 171—of the division of the lands of Egypt, 172—the former of the Hebrew alphabet, by an improvement of the Egyptian characters, 207 — the difference be-

tween contradicting the astronomy and the history written by him, 247—characters in the pagan mythology supposed by some to be intended for him, 254—one intention of his law to prohibit all intercourse between the Hebrews and the Egyptians, 281—his motives explained, 281—the reason of his unwillingness to undertake his mission, 301—his laws accommodated to the prejudices of the Jews, in favour of the Egyptian customs, 310—this no objection to the divinity of his mission, 315—his knowledge in the Egyptian learning, and the laws by him instituted, a confirmation of the divinity of his mission, 352—answers to deistical objections against the divinity of his mission, 354—vindicated from the supposition of having had recourse to fiction in certain cases, 413—his injunctions to the Jews against the local idolatry of the Cutheans, 448—his injunctions to the Jews against the local idolatry of Canaan, 453—the omission of a future state in his law, intended, iii. 3—two periods observable in his history, 3—the sense of his expressions relating to the creation of man ascertained, 131—the veil over his face explained, 185

Moses, Divine Legation of, demonstrated. The medium employed to establish his divine legation, i. 110—propositions on which this demonstration depends, 112—summary view of the opposition this performance met with, ii. 101—recapitulation of the argument proving his divine legation, iii. 238—the length of it accounted for, 242—argument designed for the subject of books vii. viii. ix. of the Divine Legation, 265, 338

Musa, Antonius, not depicted by Virgil under the character of Iapis, i. 287

Muskets, humorous story of a parcel of, with a logical inference, iii. 264

Mysteries, of the pagan religion, for what purpose instituted, i. 193—what the original ones, 194—the Eleusinian, 195—arguments in favour of, 197—who the first institutors of, 232—the abuse of them in the Christian religion, 390—explanation of that term, 391—pagan, marks of their Egyptian original, ii. 155—summary view of, iii. 245

Mythology, ancient, explanation of, ii. 29—the testimony not to be trusted, in ascertaining times and facts, 270—sources of the confusion in, 271

Mythras, priests of, explanation of their names, i. 207—probationary trials previous to initiation into the mysteries of, 256

N

Nature, state of, and civil society, difference between, i. 117—inquiry into the systems of, iii. 333

Nebuchadnezzar, inquiry into his disorder, i. 440

Nero, emperor, how deterred from attempting to intrude upon the Eleusinian mysteries, i. 197

Newton, Sir Isaac, his account of the origin of idolatry, i. 171—his system of idolatry controverted, ii. 28—his character as a natural philosopher, 246—misled by Greek mythologists, 246—the argument of his Egyptian chronology, 247—his reasons for the identity of Osiris and Sesostris, 248—his mistake in this, illustrated by a case stated in similar terms, 251—the source of his mistake, 255—his hypothesis supported principally by two mythologic fables, 272—mistakes the times of the pagan deities, compared with the era of the Trojan war, 273—his system of chronology contradictory to scripture, 277—his chronology refuted by deduction, 277—his account of Vulcan, compared with that of Homer, 279—his assertion of the conquest of Libya furnishing Egypt with horses, invalidated, 280—his opinion of the time when the Egyptians introduced animal food, refuted, 286—his period of the division of the lands of Egypt, disproved, 287—his account of the first introduction of letters into Egypt, rejected, 288—his observations, relating to the populousness of Egypt, examined, 289—makes Sesostris to be Hercules, 290—quotes Æsculapius as the first who built with square stones, 291—summary view of the dispute concerning the identity of Osiris with Sesostris, 292

Nile, the happy effects of its annual overflowings, ii. 151

Nisus and Euryalus, remarks on the episode of, in the Æneis, i. 243

Noah, his character found to answer to that of the Indian Bacchus, ii. 399

Nocturnal assemblies, of the primitive Christians, first occasion of, ii. 112—their antiquity among pagans, 130

Norden, captain, his mistaken conclusion, from a view of the pyramids, concerning the antiquity of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, corrected, ii. 383

O

Oaths, of the citizens of Athens, i. 355—of the priestesses of Bacchus, 356—solemnly regarded by the Romans, 409—Cicero's opinion of the obligation to fulfil, under the belief of the immutability of the Deity, 468

Obelisks, of the ancient Egyptians, the public records of the times, ii. 194
Obligation, duties of perfect and imperfect, how distinguished, i. 116
Ombites and Tentyrites, occasion of the intolerant proceedings of, i. 363
Omens, their admission into ancient history, accounted for, i. 173—two kinds of, 237
On, some account of the priests of, ii. 155
Oneirocritic art, explained, ii. 220—whence the art of deciphering borrowed, 222
Oracles, the original motive of consulting them, ii. 263
Origen, and Celsus, comparative characters of, i. 194—his account of the Stoical renovation, 457—his misunderstandings of the promises of the Jewish law pointed out, iii. 290
Orpheus, said to have been struck dead by lightning, i. 228—where placed in Elysium by Virgil, 275
Osiris, and Sesostris, their identity controverted against Sir Isaac Newton, ii. 249—who, 255—and Sesostris, distinguished, 255, 258—account of, and his cortege, from Diodorus Siculus, 255—his symbols, 260—proof of his antiquity equal to Moses, 260—his superior antiquity to Sesostris, ascertained, 260—his various characters at different places, as expressed in an epigram of Ausonius, 269—represented in the golden calf of the Egyptians, 303
Ovid, remarks on his Metamorphosis, i. 436
Ovid's Metamorphosis, a popular history of providence, i. 441—key to his poem, 443—Metamorphosis founded on the metempsychosis, 443—his account of Tryphon's war with the gods, ii. 227
Oxyrynchitæ and Cynopolitæ, Plutarch's account of the religious contest between, i. 364

P

Paganism, chiefly founded in the deification of dead men, i. 170—ancient, the religion of the civil magistrate, 171—favourer of mysteries, 235—the genius of, considered as opposed to the true religion, 361—intercommunity of worship general in, 362
Pan, how painted by the Egyptians, ii. 228
Pantomime, historical anecdote of the great expression of one, iii. 191—story of a famous one at Rome, 299
Parable, the origin and nature of, ii. 210
Parmenides, the philosopher, his public and private doctrines, i. 417
Passover, Jewish, its typical meaning pointed out, iii. 206
Patriarchs, Jewish, shown to be no punishers for opinions, iii. 269
Patriots, where placed in Elysium by Virgil, i. 275
Paul, St., why brought before the court of Areopagus at Athens, i. 371—why supposed not to be brought before that court in a criminal view, 403—the sense of his words in Heb. xi. 6, ascertained, ii. 53—for what purpose called to the apostleship, 323—citations from, in proof that the doctrine of a future state was not known under the Mosaic dispensation, iii. 18—that its sanctions were all temporal, 22—his sentiments of persecution before and after conversion, 53—his definition of faith, 158—a seeming contradiction in, between Acts xiii. 32, and Heb. xi. 39, reconciled, 162—an important passage in his Epistle to the Romans, viii. 3, 4, expounded, 163—his account of the institution of the Lord's supper, examined, 387—his account of justification by faith, reconciled to that of James, 399
Pelasgians, account of their adoption of the names of the Egyptian gods, and application of them to their own deities, from Herodotus, ii. 264—communicate the names of the Egyptian gods to the Greeks, 265
Perfection, the doctrine of, inquiry concerning it, iii. 398
Peripatetics, their notions of Providence, i. 474
Peripatetics and Old Academy, their conformity, ii. 71
Persecution for religious opinions, the true origin of, traced, ii. 109; iii. 269—inquiry into the nativity of, ii. 121—frequently an engine of state, 125—discountenanced by the gospel dispensation, iii. 53
Persians, why they had no statues of their gods, i. 171—their superstition described in Ezekiel's visions, ii. 309
Peruvians, remarks on the religion of, i. 169
Peter, his vision of the clean and unclean beasts, explained, ii. 326—his double sense, pointed out, iii. 216
Pharaoh, king of Egypt, the scripture account of, ii. 151—promotes Joseph, 155—an illustration of the oneirocritic art, drawn from Joseph's interpretation of his two dreams, 222—his chariots and cavalry, in the pursuit of the Israelites, 280
Pharmacy, general division of, ii. 169
Phenician superstition, described in Ezekiel's visions, ii. 309
Pherecydes Syrus, the first advancer of the notion of the τὸ ἕν, i. 493

Philosophers, Greek, legislative, always professed belief in a future state; mere philosophers, the contrary, i. 425—the causes which induced them to disbelieve a future state of rewards and punishments, 467—their conceptions of the soul, 478

Philosophy, the study of, not the only business for which man is sent into the world, i. 379

Physic, critical inquiry into the state of, in ancient Egypt, ii. 157

Pirithous, account of the fable of his design to steal Proserpine from hell, i. 270

Planet-worship, the earliest species of idolatry, ii. 30—the first religion of Greece, 260

Plants, worshipped by the Egyptians, ii. 223

Plato, the proem to his laws, i. 191—his definition of sacrilege, 191—the first of his laws, 192—his public writing shown to differ from his private sentiments, 417—a character of his politics and philosophy, 448—Cicero's remarks on his Phædo, 450—in what sense an advocate for the immortality of the soul, 451—his sentiments concerning the soul, 484

Platonists, their notions of Providence, i. 475

Pleasure, allegorical view of the dangers attending an indulgence in, i. 296

Pliny, the reason of his persecuting the Christians, ii. 110, 116—his doubts respecting the manner of proceeding against Christians, 116

Plutarch, his opinion of two principles, i. 187—his derivation of superstition, 337—his notion of death, 465—observations on his recital of the opinion of the philosophers, concerning the soul, 488—an examination of his comparison between superstition and atheism, ii. 8—his famous exclamation to his countrymen, 13—accuses the Jews of worshipping swine, 393

Pococke, his account of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, ii. 367—objections to his account, 367

Poisons, the virtue of, i. 102

Policy, human, Critias of Athens, his history of, ii. 3

Political romances, the common errors they have all fallen into, i. 120

Polybius, his testimony in favour of the piety of the Romans, i. 408—his opinion as to the means by which states are brought to ruin, 409—remarks on his character, 409

Polytheism, in what it consisted, explained, i. 299

Pomponatius, some account of, i. 123—his opinion of a future state, defended against Bayle, 124

Pope, Mr., his observations on Lord Bolingbroke, i. 338

Poppy, why the juice of, is used in the ceremonial of the shows in the Eleusinian mysteries, i. 261

Porphyry, and Clemens Alexandrinus, their accounts of the Egyptian characters and writing, ii. 191—his account of the origin of brute-worship, controverted, 233

Posterity, why the punishments of the Mosaic law extended to them, iii. 5—the case argued, 7

Posthumius, extract from his speech on the introduction of foreign worship to Rome, i. 356—his intention only to prevent the exercise of unlicensed religion, 373

Pre-existence of the soul, inquiry into the sentiments of the ancients concerning, i. 480

Press, liberty of the, propensity of the present age to infidelity, not to be ascribed to, i. 78—the complaints of its being restricted, disingenuous, 79

Prideaux, his account of the deification of heroes, controverted, ii. 238

Priests, pious and virtuous, where placed in Elysium, by Virgil, i. 275

Principles, good and evil, the belief of, how guarded against by the writer of the book of Job, iii. 116

Priscillian, the first sufferer for opinion, ii. 124

Prodigies, *&c.*, their admission into ancient history, accounted for, i. 173

Prophecies, scripture, defended from the insinuations of Dr. Middleton, iii. 204—their primary and secondary senses, distinguished, 221—misunderstood by the Jews, and why so ordained, 229—the use to be made of them in disputes, 317

Prophecy, what a necessary confirmation of their reference to the Messiah, iii. 221—an evidence of a doctrine proceeding from God, 422—considerations on, 422

Prophets, reason of the institution of a school for, ii. 317

————, Jewish, an inquiry into the nature of the divine commission to, ii. 62—rational account of their illustrating their prophecies by signs, 185

Propitiatory sacrifice, origin and nature of it, explained, iii. 371

Providence, the doctrine of, the great sanction of ancient laws, i. 179—the spirit of legislation depends on the doctrine of a, 235—the inequalities of, how rectified by the ancients, 439—what kind of, believed by the ancient theistic philosophers, 474—administration of, at various times, considered, ii. 338—remarks on the different re-

ception of its adverse dispensations, in ancient and modern times, iii. 287—Job's opinion of the equality and inequality of, 289—revival of an equal, to the chosen race, 364—considerations on God's using human instruments in the dispensations of, 460—considerations on God's using temporary plagues in the dispensations of, 466

Providence, extraordinary, a necessary consequence of the Jewish theocracy, ii. 489—illustrated from Solomon's prayer, at the dedication of the temple, 500; from Ezekiel, 501; from Amos, 501—evidences of its ceasing, 504—the ease with which the pretension to it might have been carried on, 504—the mention of the inequalities of, by the sacred writers, accounted for, 506

Psammitichus, his scheme to establish an intercourse between Egypt and the Grecian states, ii. 206

Psyche, the ancient story of, explained, i. 305

Punishments, how applied in civil society, i. 119—of the crimes of parents on their children, on what principle only to be vindicated, ii. 98

Purgatory, remarks on Virgil's account of, i. 262—the inhabitants of, 263

Pyramids of Egypt, probable reasons why they exhibit no hieroglyphic inscriptions, ii. 383—the Egyptian architecture formed on the idea of, 383—not temples, but sepulchres, 384—alluded to in the book of Job, iii. 87

Pyrrhonians, and Academics, their principles compared, i. 425—their origin, 431

Pythagoras, his knowledge in physics established in late experience concerning earthquakes, i. 424; ii. 70—an inquiry into the principles of his philosophy, i. 434—his legislative fame, 435—taught several doctrines which he did not believe, 444

Pythagoreans, their notions of providence, i. 475—their tenets concerning the human soul, 484

Q

Quakers, their motives for rejecting the institution of baptism examined into, iii. 74

Quaternion, philosophic, their opinion of the soul, i. 483

R

Rachel, the story of her stealing her father's gods, examined, iii. 269

Rainbow, first creation and reason of, ii. 405

Reason, the only test of truth, i. 87—the use of, in the discovery of truth, 101; iii. 328—why discredited in religious controversy, i. 471

Redemption by Christ, had a retrospect from the fall, iii. 365—an act of grace, not of debt, 366—the means employed in that great work inquired into, 368

Regulus, Cicero's inquiry into his obligation to return to Carthage, i. 468

Religion, the protection of, necessary in all governments, i. 107—reply to Bayle's opinion, that a man devoid of religion may be sensible of honour, 146—always the peculiar care of the magistrate, 167—the necessity of uniting it to the state, 339—brief view of the state of, in the ancient world, 357—supposed by the sages to be calculated only for the service of the state, 415—the double doctrine of the ancients considered, 417—its truth manifested by its use to society, ii. 1—if admitted to have been invented by statesmen, not therefore false, 5—an inquiry into the first origin of, 27—no people ever found without one, 47—Hooker's sentiments on the political use of, 48—too great an attention to civil liberty subversive of, 85—a comparison of the many religions that have existed in the world, the clew to the true one, 140—the absurdity of any human legislature enforcing it by penal laws, 435—Christian and Mosaic necessarily dependent on some preceding religion, 444—the care of legislators in the propagation of, iii. 246—acquired naturally by Adam and Eve, 346—first revealed in paradise, 348—reasonableness of a doctrine, no *proof*, but a *presumption*, of its divine original, 408—miracles, the only proof of a doctrine being from God, 409—prophecy an additional evidence, 422

————, established, the voice of nature, i. 339—the nature of, 340—necessary to society, 340—danger from its deviating from the truth, 344—necessity of its alliance with the state, 345—advantages to the magistrate from such an alliance, 345—what it receives from the state, 350—what it communicates to the state, 351—with a test law, the universal voice of nature, 355—speech of Posthumius on the introduction of foreign worship at Rome, 356—causes which facilitated it, 357—good purposes of, 358—distinction between established and tolerated, according to Dionysius Halicarnasseus, 374—advantages of establishments, ii. 88

————, Jewish, of names, an ancient superstition, ii. 299—not adopted by any of the neighbouring nations, and why, 455

————, natural, true definition of, ii

65—the Mosaic, a republication of, 65—teaches God to be the rewarder of them that diligently seek him, iii. 351—of what those rewards consist, 351—the distinction between natural and revealed, 362

Religion, revealed, its internal and external evidence, i. 108—the necessary qualifications for treating of them, 109—only able to enforce the sanction of reward, 120—condition of man under it, inquired into, iii. 354—the three systems of, 363

———, toleration of, motives for toleration, i. 359—danger of enforcing conformity, 359—the sense in which it was understood by the pagan world, 360

Religions, pagan, not interfering with each other, ii. 443

Religious truth, inquiry into what it is, iii. 327

——— *war*, one in ancient Egypt, and the occasion of it, i. 363

Repentance, the nature and efficacy of, considered, iii. 396

Resurrection, allegorized by the Greek philosophers, i. 502

Revelation, book of, why called "the word of prophecy," iii. 429—the predictions of this book respecting Antichrist, considered, 441

———, particular objections against, answered, ii. 60—some one embraced by all mankind, 137—natural inferences from this general propensity, 138—the use and necessity of it, 140

Revelations, pagan, one circumstance common to all, ii. 141—attributed by the primitive fathers to the devil, 142

Reward, the sanction of, explained, i. 117—enforced only by religion, 120

Rhea, observations on the fable of, ii. 236

Rhetoric, use of, disallowed at the court of Areopagus, i. 82

Riddles, propounded by the Hebrew sages, as mutual trials of sagacity, ii. 211

Ridicule, the favourite figure of speech among freethinkers, i. 81—Shaftesbury's justification of, examined, 82—not the test of truth, 86, 100—how far it may be safely made use of, 87—the defence of, by Dr. Akenside, examined, 99—the proper detector of error, 102

Rites, legal and patriarchal, not to be confounded, ii. 313

Ritual law of the Jews, made in reference to the Egyptian superstition, ii. 310—this no objection to the divinity of it, 324—characterized in Ezekiel, 337—explained, 337

Romans, to what their ruin was owing, i. 160—their law respecting tolerated religions, 372—excellence of their constitution, 408—their fear of the gods, 408—their regard for an oath, 409—their use of sacrifice at concluding treaties of peace, iii. 372

Rome, Christian, whether its superstitions borrowed from the pagan city, examined, ii. 360

Rose, what the emblem of among the ancients, i. 302—origin of the proverb "under the rose," 302

Runic alphabet, when and why changed for the Roman, ii. 208

Rutherforth, Dr., his notion of the effect the withdrawing the sanctions of the Jewish law had on the obligatory force of that law, examined, ii. 491—his notions of the temporal sanctions of the Jewish law being continued under the gospel, examined, 508—his notions of inefficacy of action without speech, examined, iii. 299

S

Sabbath, a positive institution, ii. 313—the Jews' breach of, by circumcision, considered, 404—its origin, 405

Sacred band of Thebans, Plutarch's remarks on the death of, i. 244

Sacrifice, origin and nature of, explained, iii. 370—made use of by the Romans at the ratification of peace, 372—Mosaic, examined, 377—the origin and progress of human, 379—of Christ on the cross, considered, 383—the admission of it into the Mosaic ritual, considered, 381—feast upon the sacrifice, a type of the Lord's supper, 384

Sacrifices, human, the command to Abraham to offer up his son Isaac vindicated from the objection of giving a divine sanction to, iii. 188, 192—Bryant's opinion of their origin, exploded, 449—Voltaire's opinion confuted, 451—the command that "none devoted shall be redeemed," examined, 454

Sages, ancient, unanimous in thinking the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments necessary to the well-being of society, i. 407—did not believe in a future state, 414—held it lawful for the public good, to say one thing when they thought another, 414

Sallust, his opinion of the divine nature, i. 477

Samuel, his conduct in establishing the regal form of government in Judea, ii. 471

Sanchoniatho, arguments proving that his is the history narrated in the Eleusinian mysteries, i. 212—extract from his history, 213

Sanhedrim, why instituted, ii. 317—when established, 321—motives of Jesus Christ's evasive reply to their interrogations, 321

Satan, reflections on his character as represented by Job, iii. 112—extract from the author's sermon on the fall of Satan, 476
Saul, the phrase of his being among the prophets, explained, ii. 318—characterized, 319
Savages, American, why averse to the arts of civil society, i. 378
Scarron, his artifice in ridiculing the sentiment of Sulpicius, i. 84
Scenical representations, in what respect without moral import, iii. 191
Scepticism, characterized, iii. 323
Sceptre of Judah, the common notions of that phrase examined, ii. 477—true sense of, pointed out, 487
Scriptures, sacred, a summary view of their contents, iii. 11—general rule for the interpretation of, 130—three points recommended to the attention of commentators, 149—much abused in the search after truth, 327
Self-love, the operation of, in mankind, traced, i. 144
Sempiternus, the true import of that word ascertained, i. 494
Seneca, his Consolation against the Fear of Death, i. 457—accused by St. Austin of duplicity, ii. 69
Serpent, in the fall of man, the true meaning of, ascertained, iii. 3—how the sentence passed on it is to be understood, 132
———, crooked, in Job and Isaiah, the meaning of, explained, iii. 116
Sesostris, account of, from Diodorus Siculus, ii. 153—and Osiris, arguments against the identity of, in opposition to Sir Isaac Newton, 249—and Osiris distinguished, 255–260—who, 255—divides Egypt by transverse canals, 256—his motives for, 288
Shaftesbury, Lord, remarks on his character, i. 89—his unfair treatment of Mr. Locke, 89
Sherlock, Bishop, his notion of the tribal sceptre of Judah, examined, ii. 479
Shuckford, Dr., his remarks on the ancient ritual law, examined, ii. 337, 403
Sibyl, how that character in the Æneis is to be understood, i. 250
Signs, memorable instance of divine instruction communicated by, in the case of Abraham, iii. 170
Silenus, whence Ovid derived his idea of, i. 441
Sleeping scheme, the principles of, examined, iii. 25
Society, civil, the first invention of, and the motives to, i. 114—no preservative against moral disorders, 115—unable to enforce the sanction of reward, i. 117—which is only to be supplied by religion, 120—mutual stipulations between magistrate and people on entering into, 118—the purpose of its institution, 341—the extent of its care, 341—invented for intractable spirits, 408
Society, religious, the end of its institution, i. 342—sovereign and independent on the civil, 342—not possessed of any civil coactive power, 342—the object of its care, 343
Socinians, examination of their opinion concerning the death of Christ, iii. 390
Socrates, review of the dispute between him and Aristophanes, i. 85—why he declined initiation into the mysteries, 220—remarks on the latter part of his conduct, 415—the first who called off philosophy from the contemplation of nature to morals, 428—the only Greek philosopher who really believed a future state of rewards and punishments, 429—the method of his philosophy, 431—note on the effect of the poison, ii. 68
Socratic method of disputing, what so called, i. 432
Solomon, alludes to the Mysteries in the book of Ecclesiasticus, (iv. 17, 18,) i. 278—his violations of the Mosaic law remarked, ii. 282—his prayer at the dedication of the temple, illustrative of the particular providence over the Jewish nation, 500—in his prayer at the dedication of the temple, requests only a continuance of temporal rewards and punishments, iii. 2—how perverted to idolatry, 106
Solomon's Song, a representation of Christ's union and marriage with the church, iii. 286
Sophists, Greek, some account of, i. 432
Soul, the several senses in which the ancients conceived the permanency of it, i. 413—its future existence in a state of rewards and punishments taught, but disbelieved, by the philosophers, 413—Cicero's idea of, 461—an inquiry into our conceptions of, 478—three species of, admitted by the ancients, 479—opinions of various philosophers, 488—the opinions of the philosophers on the immortality of, ii. 78—the sentiments of the Jews concerning, under the law, iii. 24—examination of the notion of the sleep of, 25—the mention of its future existence by Moses, and by following writers, to be distinguished, 73—immaterial, common to the whole animal creation, 131—living, in what sense to be understood as used in the history of the creation of man, 132—inquiry into the nature of, 352—different opinions on the, 349
Speech, the origin and history of, ii. 185—the early acquisition of, by Adam and Eve, iii. 347

Spencer, an examination of the argument of his treatise, *De Theocratia Judaica*, ii. 474 — examination of Sykes's defence of his argument, iii. 54
Spinosists, their opinion of the human soul, i. 479
Spiritual courts, the end and use of, i. 347
State, its inducements to seek an alliance with the church, i. 344—what it communicates to the church, 350—what it receives from the church, 351 — its conduct where it includes more than one religion, 353
Statues, the first rise of worshipping, in human form, ii. 262
Stebbing, Dr., an examination of his objection to the argument of the Divine Legation of Moses, ii. 51—his arguments of Moses's divine legation, equally applicable to Mahomet, 512—his exposition of Lev. xviii. 5, examined, iii. 141—an examination of his Considerations on the Command to Abraham to offer up Isaac, 184, 292, 296, 300, 301, 304, 305, 308, 311, 312, 314, 315
Stillingfleet, his opinion of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, ii. 195
Stoical renovation, what, i. 457
Stoics, their practice contrary to their principles, i. 148—their notions of death, 456—their opinions of the soul, 487
Strabo, his opinion concerning the institution of the Mysteries, i. 210—his opinion as to the necessary religious doctrines by which to govern and restrain the multitude, 411—his account of the Mosaic doctrine of the Deity, 489
Stratonicean, whether the principles of a, be capable of distinguishing the moral difference between virtue and vice, i. 134
Suicide, why consigned by Virgil to purgatory, i. 263 — condemned in the Eleusinian Mysteries, and by Virgil, 286—authors who have written against it, 396
Sulpicius, his reflections on the sight of Grecian ruins, i. 84
Sun, the various names under which it was worshipped, ii. 35
Superstition, in ancient history accounted for, i. 173—whence derived, and the cure of it, 337—whether preferable to atheism, ii. 6—examination of Plutarch's parallel between, 8—of lord Bacon's parallel between it and atheism, 20
Swift, his observations on Toland and Asgill, i. 338
Sykes, his answer to a censure passed on Spencer's opinion of the Jewish theocracy, considered, iii. 354, 363—his notion concerning the double senses of the scripture prophecies, examined, 213
Symbols, and allegories of ancient paganism, for what purpose introduced, ii. 37—their revolution from being employed for contrary purposes to their primitive designation, pointed out, 210—and types, their difference explained, iii. 382
Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, some account of, i. 501—allegorizes the resurrection, 501
System and hypothesis, the human mind naturally inclined to, ii. 147

T

Tacitus, his character of the Jews and Christians, i. 368—his opinion of the Jewish religion, ii. 110—his account of the ancient Theban monuments, 195
Tages, the Etruscan god, how found, ii. 245
Talismans, greatly venerated by the Mahometans, ii. 217—what they were, 389
Tartarus, observations on Virgil's account of, i. 262—who consigned to, 269
Taylor, Dr., examination of his account of the origin of persecution, ii. 109
Telemachus, why he refused the horses of Menelaus, ii. 283
Tertullian, his account of the origin of heresies, i. 502
Test law, whence it took its birth, i. 353—copy of the test oath of Athens, 355
Thebans, account of the sacred band, i. 244
Theistical opinion, concerning the human soul, i. 479
Theocratic government of the Jews, the reasons and conveniences of the, ii. 419–436—every subject a priest under the, 430—particular inquiry into the circumstances of the, 431–462—why willingly received by them, 438—how long subsisting, 468—when abolished, 476—necessarily including an extraordinary providence, 489 — illustrated from Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple, 500; from Ezekiel, 501; from Amos, 501—Dr. Sykes's answer to the censure passed on Spencer, considered, iii. 54
Theology, natural, the obligations flowing from, as given by lord Bolingbroke, i. 332
————, pagan, three systems of, i. 206
Theopompus, the common source from which both Ovid and Virgil borrowed, and wherein they erred in deviation from him, i. 441

Theseus, exposition of his descent into hell, i. 247, 272
Timæus, his exposition of the ancient metempsychosis, i. 444
Τὸ ἓν, not an Egyptian notion, i. 491—derived from Pherecydes Syrus, 493
Toland, character of his *Pantheisticon*, ii. 27
Toleration, juster notions of it entertained by the ancients than by the moderns, i. 359—two principal causes inducing a large and full allowance of, by the ancient lawgivers, 359—the Romans careful not to infringe it, in their edict against the bacchanalian rites, 373—universal, among all the ancient nations, and why, ii. 127
Toyman, at Bath, pertinent story of, iii. 239
Traditions, mistaken presumption to strengthen the authority of, by the church of Rome, iii. 16—never made use of by Christ in support of his character, 174
Treason, high, observations on the laws of forfeitures in cases of, iii. 8
Trismegistus, history of the books forged in the name of, i. 497
Truth, whether possible to be made ridiculous, i. 83—reason the best test of, 87—reason and ridicule considered in the trial of, 102—reasons for veiling it in Mysteries, 200—and utility, their coincidence, and the mutual proof they afford of each other, ii. 2—inquiry into what it is, iii. 324
Turnus, remarks on the character of, in the Æneis, i. 240
Type and symbol, their difference explained, iii. 382
Types, the meaning of, ascertained, iii. 198—derivation of, 200—argument deduced from the general passion for, 236—retained by Mr. Whiston's opinion, whilst he rejects double senses, 316
Typhon, the fable of, explained, ii. 227, 254
Tyrants, ancient, great encouragers of religion, and from what motives, i. 176

U

Unity of the Deity, taught in the Eleusinian Mysteries, i. 276
Universality, the want of, no objection against the truth of the Mosaic dispensation, ii. 61
Utility, indicative of truth, ii. 2

V

Vane, Sir Harry, his character, ii. 25
Vedam, the antiquity of it, ii. 361
Vine-tree, Ezekiel's prophecy of it, explained, ii. 421
Vigils, supposed to have originated from the Eleusinian Mysteries, i. 225—suppressed on the same account, 225
Virgil, an exposition of his allegory of the descent of Æneas to the shades, i. 235—an inquiry into the nature of the Æneid, 235—remarks on his destroying the myrtle which dropped blood, 237—remarks on his making ships become deities, 238—remarks on the character of Turnus, 240—remarks on the character of Dido, 240—remarks on Voltaire's criticism on this story, 241—remarks on his account of the court of Evander, 242—remarks on the episode of Nisus and Euryalus, 243—recommends adoption, 243—explanation of the golden bough, 251—his account of the Mysteries of Mythras, 256—exposition of his character of Charon, 260—explanation of the dog Cerberus, 261—comment on his topography of the infernal regions, 262—remarks on the episodes of Dido and Deiphobus, 268—his description of Elysium compared with that of Homer, 274—infected with Spinosism, 277—remarks on his description of the shield of Æneas, 283
Virtue, three different excitements to, i. 130—natural and moral obligations to, distinguished, 135—an inquiry into the nature of, under a dispensation of rewards and punishments, iii. 47
Voice of the sign, origin of, ii. 185
Voltaire, remarks on his criticism on the Dido of Virgil, i. 241—examination of his method of accounting for the persecuting spirit among Christians, 400—examination of his objections to the argument of the Divine Legation of Moses, ii. 50—his account of the Chinese method of printing, 374—his account of the Mosaic dispensation examined, 421—his misrepresentation of Judea refuted, 425—some mistakes in his treatise on toleration, noted, iii. 66—his opinion of the origin of human sacrifices, confuted, 433—his accusation of the Jews' sacrificing a whole nation, examined, 445
Vossius, his account of the origin of idolatry, refuted, ii. 233
Vows, the origin and obligation of, considered, iii. 454—the command that "none devoted shall be redeemed," examined, 454—Jephthah's rash vow considered, 458
Vulcan, Sir Isaac Newton's account of, ii. 279—compared with that of Homer, 279

W

Wants of mankind, real and fantastic, inquiry into, and the effects of, i. 154
War, the different situations of coun-

tries for the use of infantry and cavalry, ii. 283
Warburton, answer to the objections of the chancellor of Gottingen, i. 504—motives for writing "the Alliance between Church and State," ii. 88—extract from his sermon on the Rise of Antichrist, iii. 429 — and from the Fall of Satan, 476
Will, the foundation of morality, i. 138
William the Conqueror and King Arthur, the similarity of the outlines of their characters, ii. 251
William of Newbourg, his character of Pope Gregory VIII., iii. 241
Witsius, his arguments for the Egyptian ritual being borrowed from the Jews, examined, ii. 312—critique on his *Egyptiaca*, 329
Wives, strange or idolatrous, bad consequences of the fondness the Jews had for them, shown, iii. 105
Wollaston, his mistake in establishing the principles of morality, explained, i. 140
Words, mischief attending the improper use of them, i. 141
Works, no justification by, under the gospel, iii. 164
Writing, history of the art of, ii. 173
Writings, ancient, marks of forgery in, i. 182

Y

Youth, adopted, the strength of ancient states, i. 243

Z

Zaleucus, his real existence, and the authenticity of his remains, defended against Bentley, i. 180—extract from his preface, 188—notes on a passage in, 382
Zeno, his philosophic character, i. 455
Zoroastes, the various opinions of the learned, who he was, ii. 361—of Hyde and Prideaux discredited, 442
Zosimus, his relation how the Eleusinian Mysteries came to be excepted in Valentinian's edict against nocturnal assemblies, i. 224

AUTHORS, &c.

QUOTED IN THE DIVINE LEGATION;

WHICH QUOTATIONS ARE NOT REFERRED TO IN THE PRECEDING INDEX.

A

Aben Ezra, ii. 169, 204; iii. 3
Abennephi, ii. 243
Abul-Feda, i. 394, 396
Acosta, ii. 94, 173, 178, 179
Addison, i. 82, 237, 268, 290; iii. 316
Adrian the Sophist, i. 441
Ælian, i. 420, 424, 448, 494; ii. 225, 257
Æschylus, i. 167, 220, 372, 380; ii. 82, 365
Æsop, ii 378; iii. 275
Ætius, iii. 474
Africanus, i. 392, 393
Agellius, i. 431
Ahijah, iii. 190
Akenside, i. 99
Albinus, i. 287, 288, 449, 450
Albo, Rabbi Joseph, iii. 225
Alcoran, ii. 285
Alembert, D', i. 155, 388
Ambrose, i. 349
Ammianus Marcellinus, i. 187, 230, 491; ii. 194, 308
Amos, ii. 214, 304, 342, 507; iii. 91, 223
Anaxagoras, i. 323, 333, 418; ii. 16
Andocides, i. 178, 228
Antoninus, Marcus, emperor, i. 369, 402, 456, 469, 487
Antonius Liberalis, i. 441, 443; ii. 228
Apion, iii. 54, 57
Apollodorus, i. 175, 282; ii. 364
Apollonius, i. 258, 261; ii. 155
——— Rhodius, i. 246
——— Tyaneus, i. 228
Apuleius, i. 82, 199, 219, 231, 235, 249, 252, 274, 281, 284, 287, 289, 310, 389, 397, 458, 476, 496; ii. 35, 165, 180, 194, 199, 200, 210, 268, 366, 386; iii. 245
Aratus, ii. 232
Arbuthnot, i. 87
Ariosto, i. 310
Aristides, i. 196, 197, 199, 225, 272, 273, 275, 276, 281, 282
Aristophanes, i. 102, 133, 167, 197, 199, 201, 217, 232, 233, 248, 273, 301, 372; ii. 35, 92
Aristotle, i. 114, 115, 134, 176, 180, 204, 236, 314, 341, 346, 417, 422, 425, 453, 454, 474, 476, 485, 491; ii. 214, 256, 499; iii. 2
Arnauld, iii. 168
Arnobius, i. 109, 194, 291, 482, 483, 485; ii. 40, 69
Arrian, i. 198, 487; ii. 256
Artemidorus, i. 299; ii. 220
Astruc, ii. 301, 387
Athanasius, i. 390
Athenæus, ii. 48
Athenagoras, i. 218, 220, 383
Atterbury, Bishop, i. 287
Atticus, i. 151; ii. 120
Augustine, i. 172, 199, 201, 204, 297, 391, 405, 416, 434, 466, 480, 484, 503; ii. 44, 69, 120, 202, 239, 240, 395; iii. 169
Aulus Gellius, i. 271; ii. 276
Aurelius, Marcus, i. 288; ii. 111
Ausonius, ii. 74, 269

B

Bacon, Lord Chancellor, i. 113, 437; ii. 7, 16, 17, 20, 21, 134, 412; iii. 249, 332, 337, 353
———, Roger, iii. 291
Banier, i. 251, 380, 438, 443; ii. 396
Barbeyrac, i. 396
Barnes, ii. 82
Baronius, i. 234, 390
Barrow, Dr., i. 331
Barthius, i. 288
Basilius, i. 391
Bate, Julius, ii. 104
Baxter, ii. 391; iii. 26, 131, 345, 447
Bayle, i. 123, 134, 145, 154, 166, 172, 181, 260, 264, 373, 490; ii. 7, 81; iii. 243, 249
Beausobre, i. 498; ii. 389
Behmen, iii. 447
Bellarmine, i. 225
Bembine Table, ii. 198, 200, 210, 234, 308, 365, 394, 395
Bentley, i. 180, 184, 381, 397, 417; ii. 73, 387; iii. 271, 413
Berkeley, iii. 17

Bernier, i. 365, 399
Berosus, i. 257, 258
Blackwell, ii. 41
Blanchini, i. 81
Bleterie, ii. 399
Blount, ii. 1, 3
Bochart, ii. 204, 393, 396, 397, 399
Bœus, i. 441
Bolingbroke, i. 90, 161, 312; ii. 51, 67, 89, 315, 362, 429, 435, 457, 462, 463; iii. 11, 64, 157, 257, 317, 449
Bossu, i. 237
Bossuet, iii. 468
Bouiller, iii. 298, 319
Boulainvilliers, Compte de, i. 169
Bryant, iii. 449
Bull, Bishop, iii. 167, 273
Bullet, ii. 389
Burlamaqui, i. 140, 141
Burnet, i. 421, 492; ii. 292, 406
Butler, i. 85, 314; ii. 291

C

Cæcilius, i. 230
Cæsar, i. 426; ii. 397, 399
Callimachus, i. 222; ii. 276
Callisthenes, i. 441
Calmet, iii. 9, 51, 52, 98, 121, 122, 274
Capitolinus. See *Julius*.
Cardan, i. 123, 153; ii. 21
Careri, ii. 173
Cartesius, i. 492, 510
Casaubon, i. 234, 390, 488, 491, 499; ii. 68, 256
Cassiodorus, ii. 217
Cassius, i. 151
Castellio, iii. 147
Cato, i. 426; ii. 70
Catrou, i. 442
Caylus, ii. 373
Celsus, i. 195, 229, 256, 262, 367, 389, 453, 454, 456, 457, 472, 493, 501; ii. 74, 119, 161, 164, 165, 447; iii. 57, 290
Cervantes, i. 85, 314, 429; ii. 83
Chæremon, ii. 363, 364, 379
Chalcidias, i. 475
Charlevoix, i. 394, 406, 439; ii. 175
Chillingworth, iii. 94
Choisi, Abbé de, i. 399
Chrysippus, i. 209, 453
Chrysostom, i. 391, 403; iii. 180, 203, 411, 413
Chubb, iii. 61
Cicero, i. 82, 93, 117, 148, 153, 167, 170, 180, 182, 186, 190, 195, 196, 208, 210, 213, 214, 221, 222, 224, 226, 228, 236, 242, 243, 245, 250, 263, 277, 282, 284, 359, 360, 371, 372, 382, 384, 385, 388, 390, 393, 396, 398, 405, 416, 426, 428, 429, 430, 432, 433, 435, 447, 448, 450, 455, 458, 468, 469, 472, 475, 480, 481, 483, 493, 501, 510; ii. 27, 48, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 83, 120, 127, 128, 133, 168, 184, 201, 213, 230, 387, 393, 395; iii. 9, 13, 65, 239
Clarius, iii. 127
Clarke, i. 87, 140, 314, 326, 327, 331; ii. 79, 166; iii. 26, 42, 72, 131, 138, 345, 446, 447
Claudian, i. 122, 253, 254
Clemens Alexandrinus, i. 181, 200, 201, 203, 209, 217, 218, 220, 228, 229, 235, 247, 252, 388, 424, 458, 491, 493; ii. 35, 36, 164, 176, 187, 191, 194, 196, 197, 200, 203, 255, 314, 325, 375, 379, 381, 382, 386, 387, 391, 395
Clerc, Le, i. 219, 390, 391, 392, 400, 446; ii. 185, 380, 390, 391, 396, 470, 471, 473, 474, 475; iii. 4, 25, 92, 93, 107, 147, 151, 340
Cocceius, ii. 155; iii. 105
Codrus, i. 81
Codurcus, iii. 88
Collins, i. 87, 94, 95; ii. 95, 96, 378, 407, 440, 499, 509; iii. 3, 26, 175, 197, 198, 202, 220, 226, 260, 262, 315, 317, 318, 448
Compte, M. le, ii. 178, 386
Condamine, i. 378; ii. 388
Condillac, ii. 387, 389
Cornelius Nepos, i. 387
Cotta, i. 385; ii. 393
Coward, ii. 1, 86; iii. 26
Craig, i. 108
Crinitus, P., i. 395; ii. 388
Critias, ii. 3, 30, 81
Croze, M. la, i. 500
Ctesiphon, i. 484
Cudworth, i. 480, 485, 488, 492, 499, 510; ii. 42, 233, 362; iii. 245
Cumberland, ii. 270, 362, 366
Cuper, i. 111
Cyprian, i. 207; ii. 395
Cyrillus, i. 289, 362, 369

D

Dacier, i. 280, 395, 445, 469
Daniel, ii. 212, 214; iii. 181, 424
Dassovius, ii. 97
Daubuz, ii. 246, 391, 392; iii. 173, 293
David, King, ii. 212, 448, 506; iii. 14, 15, 59, 145, 146, 147
Davies, i. 460
Demetrius Phalereus, i. 201; ii. 211, 373
Democritus, ii. 78, 79, 204
Demosthenes, i. 356
Diagoras, i. 151
Diodorus Siculus, i. 175, 176, 180, 181, 194, 215, 221, 231, 233, 246, 259, 264, 268, 363, 370, 384, 391, 420; ii. 22, 31, 34, 35, 152, 153, 154, 155, 158, 159, 161, 170, 194, 196, 198, 200, 203, 204, 213, 227, 229, 231, 253, 254, 256, 257, 259, 260, 264, 269, 270, 273, 278, 297, 298, 314, 364, 375, 384, 389, 393, 395, 402

Diogenes Laertius, i. 187, 197, 218, 228, 423, 424, 433, 435, 445, 449, 482, 484, 494, 499; ii. 39, 72, 204, 272, 273
Dion Cassius, i. 198, 375; ii. 76
—— Chrysostom, i. 218, 253
Dionysius the African, i. 195
———— Halicarnasseus, i. 204, 222, 224, 243, 283, 366, 374, 389, 390, 391; ii. 29, 275
———— Thracius, i. 252
Dodwell, ii. 407, 446, 483; iii. 328
Donatus, i. 199, 494
Dorotheus, i. 441
Drusius, iii. 25, 127
Dryden, i. 79; iii. 275
Dudley, ii. 70

E

Edda Snorro, ii. 240
Egede, i. 406; ii. 385, 389
Ekell, iii. 272
Elihu, iii. 89
Eliphaz, iii. 86, 88
Empedocles, i. 447
Enfant, L', i. 401
Epicharmus, i. 447; iii. 329
Epictetus, i. 197, 198, 425, 456, 487
Epicurus, i. 151, 447, 493; ii. 78
Epiphanius, i. 194; ii. 362
Episcopius, iii. 151, 167, 433
Erasmus, ii. 92; iii. 180
Euclid, i. 491; iii. 318
Euhemerus, i. 151, 208, 220, 338; ii. 27, 37, 39, 240, 396
Eunapius, i. 207, 420
Eupolemus, ii. 364
Euripides, i. 167, 195, 199, 201, 204, 225, 248, 250, 259, 279, 500; ii. 81, 82; iii. 170, 278
Eusebius, i. 112, 184, 204, 210, 212, 220, 363, 369, 380, 386, 392, 398, 400, 417, 448, 449, 473, 485, 496, 498; ii. 30, 35, 38, 68, 69, 111, 137, 139, 140, 141, 177, 197, 204, 205, 238, 243, 255, 256, 367, 373, 393, 395; iii. 194, 245
Eustathius, i. 176; ii. 366, 375
Evemerus. See *Euhemerus.*
Evremond, St., i. 239
Ezekiel, ii. 145, 185, 186, 189, 210, 211, 302, 304, 305, 307, 309, 310, 314, 315, 335, 336, 337, 395, 405, 420, 421, 425, 452, 454, 456, 490, 500, 501, 506; iii. 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 59, 64, 66, 112, 129, 198, 229, 230, 254, 255, 258, 304, 379, 413, 453
Ezra, ii. 497; iii. 94, 95, 100, 102, 103, 105, 106, 109, 110, 111, 121, 123, 271, 277

F

Fabricius, i. 228, 388, 401, 449, 476
Faustus, ii. 508
Felton, iii. 128
Fenton, ii. 276
Ferrerius, iii. 476
Ficinus. See *Marsilius.*
Fienus, iii. 476
Firmicus. See *Julius.*
Fleuri, i. 288; ii. 388
Fontenelle, i. 420, 467, 468; ii. 23
Foster, iii. 53
Fourmont, ii. 204, 223, 243, 372, 396, 399, 402
Freind, iii. 474
Freret, ii. 181, 398; iii. 292

G

Gagnier, i. 396
Gale, i. 98; ii. 362, 382
Galen, i. 210, 417, 425; ii. 167
Garcilasso, ii. 397
Gassendi, i. 482
Gataker, i. 487
Gaubil, ii. 182
Gaudentius, i. 391
Geddes, ii. 73
Gellius. See *Aulus.*
Geoffry of Monmouth, ii. 389
Gordon, ii. 366
Grævius, ii. 72
Gregorius Magnus, i. 390
———— Nazianzenus, i. 198, 200, 436, 437, 498
Gregory Nyssen, ii. 375
Grey, iii. 93, 276, 277, 279, 288
Gronovius, i. 418
Grotius, i. 343; ii. 82, 212, 331; iii. 8, 51, 83, 92, 122, 138, 151, 167, 222, 226, 230, 254, 285, 433, 439, 448
Gruter, i. 405
Guignes, ii. 371, 372

H

Habakkuk, ii. 215; iii. 141, 142, 160
Haggai, ii. 475, 476; iii. 100, 121, 127
Halde, M. du, ii. 178, 179, 216, 219, 220
Hales, iii. 291
Hammond, ii. 362; iii. 146, 433
Harduin, iii. 268, 270, 271
Hare, Bishop, i. 79; ii. 212, 497; iii. 147, 148
Hecatæus, i. 380
Heliodorus, ii. 204
Hellanicus, ii. 386
Hennepin, i. 406
Heraclides Ponticus, ii. 39
Heraclitus, i. 177; ii. 187
Herbelot, iii. 76, 134
Herbert, Lord, i. 122
Hermapion, ii. 194, 196
Hermes Trismegistus, i. 383, 496, 498, 499; ii. 196, 300
Hermias, i. 485
Hermippus, i. 175
Herodotus, i. 98, 171, 186, 215, 231, 259, 362, 380, 420, 435, 493; ii. 28,

31, 34, 145, 154, 155, 156, 157, 159, 161, 162, 167, 168, 170, 171, 187, 203, 206, 208, 221, 225, 227, 228, 229, 255, 256, 259, 263, 264, 265, 269, 270, 272, 275, 285, 288, 299, 303, 364, 376, 384, 399; iii. 299
Hesiod, i. 147, 167; ii. 42, 237, 265, 363, 378, 385
Hesychius, i. 98; ii. 155
Hezekiah, iii. 14
Hicesius, i. 293
Hierocles, i. 495
Higden, ii. 493
Himerius, i. 277
Hippocrates, i. 425; ii. 158, 164, 166, 169, 170
Hippolytus, i. 270
Hippon, i. 151
Hispala, i. 227
Hoadley, ii. 88
Hobbes, i. 90, 114, 136, 177; ii. 106, 492; iii. 35, 242, 268
Holstenius, ii. 379
Homer, i. 153, 167, 176, 236, 237, 245, 246, 259, 274, 279, 393, 435, 493; ii. 39, 158, 161, 164, 165, 166, 237, 265, 274, 275, 276, 363, 365, 378, 387, 400, 402; iii. 70, 71
Hooke, iii. 320
Hooker, i. 113, 114, 138; ii. 48, 511; iii. 252, 340
Horace, i. 254, 280; iii. 216, 272, 275, 284
Horapollo, i. 200, 266, 496; ii. 31, 175, 176, 193, 197, 198, 209, 214, 393
Hosea, ii. 320, 453, 472; iii. 6, 105, 173, 311
Houbigant, ii. 411; iii. 91, 182, 278, 279
Houteville, ii. 479
Hudibras, iii. 27
Huet, i. 438; ii. 396, 399
Huntington, ii. 199
Hurd, iii. 316
Hutchinson, ii. 376
Hyde, ii. 361, 442
Hyginus, i. 271; ii. 291

I

Irenæus, i. 483; ii. 204, 362; iii. 68
Isaiah, i. 370; ii. 64, 153, 363, 366, 391, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 501, 507; iii. 2, 8, 14, 87, 89, 116, 128, 129, 202, 222, 224, 226, 227, 228, 229, 426
Isocrates, i. 222, 225, 346, 425

J

Jablonski, i. 382; ii. 393
Jackson, i. 311; ii. 385
Jamblichus, i. 184, 185, 186, 187, 226, 273, 293, 310, 381, 382, 391, 424, 434, 435, 450, 491, 498, 500; ii. 166, 176, 233, 391
James, St., iii. 98, 328, 399, 400
Jameson, ii. 363, 364
Jarchi, iii. 3
Jeremiah, ii. 63, 64, 157, 185, 188, 189, 306, 310, 414, 448, 451, 452, 454, 456, 507; iii. 2, 5, 6, 9, 14, 61, 64, 94, 96, 106, 147, 181, 222, 228, 229, 258, 453
Jerom, i. 230, 251, 367, 435, 470, 471, 472, 484; ii. 23, 217, 386, 395; iii. 91, 97, 108, 332
Job, iii. 13
John, ii. 510; iii. 181, 212, 304, 328, 366, 369, 404, 411, 416, 424, 428, 448
Johnson, ii. 47
Joinville, i. 184
Jonson, Ben, ii. 83; iii. 286
Jortin, ii. 186
Josephus, i. 196, 371, 392, 448; ii. 209, 211, 212, 275, 356, 363, 457, 465, 498, 499; iii. 52, 54, 57
Joshua, ii. 304, 450
Jotham, ii. 210
Jude, iii. 26
Julian, i. 362, 369, 371, 403, 454; ii. 111; iii. 209
Julius Capitolinus, i. 198, 287, 288
——— Firmicus, i. 200, 208; ii. 395
Justin, i. 387; ii. 275, 363
——— Martyr, i. 235, 289, 483; ii. 439
Justinian, ii. 77
Juvenal, i. 250, 262; ii. 70

K

Kaimes, Lord, i. 99
Kircher, ii. 178, 195, 196, 198, 217, 233, 234, 308, 365, 372, 373, 380, 386, 391; iii. 236
Kimchi, ii. 337
Kuster, ii. 379

L

Lactantius, i. 91, 109, 455, 470, 471, 473, 474, 478; ii. 69, 300; iii. 83, 316
Lafitau, ii. 30, 388
Lampridius, i. 367, 401
Lardner, iii. 472
Laud, iii. 433
Lavaur, i. 438
Law, ii. 134; iii. 447
Leland, iii. 146
Leonard, ii. 363
Libanius, i. 197, 234
Liberalis. See *Antonius Liberalis*.
Licinius Mucianus, ii. 387
Limborch, ii. 94, 96; iii. 57, 66, 332
Linus, i. 499
Livy, i. 227, 243, 271, 272, 285, 356, 360, 372, 373, 389, 393, 394, 405, 416; ii. 23, 83, 429; iii. 372
Locke, i. 88, 90, 94, 100, 114, 144, 234, 341; ii. 244; iii. 272, 278, 358, 407, 445, 447
Lucan, i. 222, 397; ii. 218

Lucian, i. 168, 199, 209, 220, 229, 233, 255, 268, 282, 295, 398, 429, 457; ii. 227, 228, 231, 254, 393, 418
Lucretius, i. 146, 412, 447, 464, 465
Lucullus, i. 228, 433; ii. 75
Luke, i. 403; iii. 53, 141, 142, 189, 211, 304, 194, 414, 416, 417, 478
Lysias, i. 332

M

Mabillon, i. 402
Machiavel, i. 177, 346
Macrobius, i. 214, 243, 246, 288, 418, 419; ii. 35, 220, 413
Magaillans, ii. 183
Mahomet, i. 394
Maimonides, ii. 96, 97, 147, 186, 311, 332, 359, 415, 503; iii. 80, 83, 97, 276, 286
Malachi, ii. 64, 476, 507; iii. 100, 102, 103, 105, 106, 110, 119, 121, 127, 221
Malebranche, ii. 73
Manasseh Ben Israel, iii. 127, 139, 150
Mandeville, i. 133, 156; iii. 244
Manetho, i. 392, 393; ii. 163, 204, 209, 356, 411
Mann, ii. 247–249
Manutius, i. 460
Marinus, i. 416
Mark, iii. 211, 303, 417
Marsham, i. 215, 260, 386, 392, 393; ii. 147, 153, 208, 217, 256, 312, 326, 375, 381, 411, 412; iii. 54, 193, 295, 450
Marsilius Ficinus, i. 510; ii. 389
Martinius, ii. 180
Matthew, ii. 347, 509, 510; iii. 3, 143, 151, 153, 211, 309, 310, 414, 416, 417, 474, 477
Maximus Tyrius, i. 178; ii. 120
Mead, ii. 407; iii. 472
Mede, ii. 246; iii. 432
Melampus, ii. 164, 229
Melanthius, i. 293
Melchior Canus, i. 123
Menage, ii. 387
Menander, i. 293
Mercurius Trismegistus, i. 255
Metrodorus, ii. 39
Meursius, i. 219, 232
Micah, ii. 215; iii. 451, 461, 462
Middleton, i. 187; ii. 71, 75, 94, 413, 415; iii. 83, 204, 318, 359, 361, 407, 424, 425, 470
Milton, i. 245, 287, 398, 399, 478; ii. 268
Minutius Felix, i. 383, 398, 399; ii. 38, 124; iii. 266
Moliere, ii. 82; iii. 61
Montaigne, i. 146
Montesquieu, i. 108, 397; ii. 67
Moor, i. 487
Morgan, ii. 95, 361; iii. 197
Mosheim, i. 389, 397; ii. 70, 71; iii. 291
Moyle, i. 402; ii. 70
Muret, ii. 399
Musæus, i. 167, 276

N

Needham, ii. 370, 372
Nehemiah, ii. 497; iii. 94, 101, 102, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 123
Nemesius, i. 487
Nepos. See *Cornelius.*
Newton, Sir Isaac, i. 171, 316, 336, 490, 491, 492; ii. 28, 145, 237, 246, 256, 258, 267, 269, 271, 272, 276, 285, 292, 362, 397, 404; iii. 2, 212, 245, 253, 385, 409, 428, 434, 445
Nicander, i. 441
Nicanor, i. 151
Nicephorus, Gregoras, i. 200
Nonnus, i. 222, 256; iii. 189
Norden, ii. 383
Numenius, i. 449

O

Ocellus Lucanus, i. 184, 381
Oldmixon, i. 181
Oribasius, iii. 474
Origen, i. 194, 195, 226, 229, 256, 291, 367, 389, 421, 423, 431, 434, 453, 456, 457, 458, 472, 479, 493; ii. 68, 119, 447; iii. 10, 57, 235, 290
Orobio, ii. 54, 96, 98, 99; iii. 66
Orpheus, i. 167, 184, 217, 218, 228
Otter, Tom, ii. 232
Outram, iii. 24
Ovid, i. 238, 247, 252, 290, 396, 436, 438, 441, 442, 443; ii. 227, 240, 275; iii. 247

P

Pacuvianus, i. 480
Palæphatus, i. 437, 443
Parennin, ii. 182
Parmenides, i. 417
Parthenius, i. 441
Pascal, iii. 195
Pasquier, i. 184
Paterculus. See *Velleius.*
Paul, i. 133, 196, 264, 312, 331, 389, 390, 402, 501; ii. 33, 54, 94, 98, 298, 420, 424, 476, 502, 509; iii. 3, 14, 15, 24, 27, 51, 53, 57, 60, 72, 74, 122, 128, 132, 134, 136, 138, 141, 142, 152, 157, 160, 177, 178, 195, 211, 212, 245, 277, 304, 328, 351, 358, 368, 369, 370, 387, 388, 392, 398, 399, 400, 411, 412, 413, 428, 429, 430, 436, 445, 448, 469, 470
Pausanias, i. 196, 215, 218, 261, 270, 290, 299; ii. 36
Pearce, iii. 340
Pericles, i. 264
Persius, iii. 376
Petavius, ii. 375, 479
Peter, ii. 509; iii. 74, 145, 212, 216, 309, 366, 392, 411, 425, 428, 429, 430

Peters, iii. 70
Petit, de la Croix, i. 175
——, S., i. 219, 405; ii. 81
Petreus, iii. 290
Phædrus, iii. 236
Phalaris, i. 381
Pherecydes Syrus, ii. 187
Philo, i. 216, 502; ii. 367, 394, 499; iii. 341, 450
Philo-Biblius, i. 212, 387; ii. 35, 204, 255; iii. 193, 379
Philo-Judæus, iii. 132
Philostratus, i. 198, 228, 293
Phoronis, ii. 36
Photius, i. 295, 486
Pindar, i. 250, 251, 272; iii. 12, 13
Plato, i. 134, 143, 167, 175, 190, 192, 197, 204, 205, 206, 220, 222, 236, 245, 250, 258, 262, 263, 264, 265, 268, 275, 276, 286, 312, 382, 395, 408, 416, 417, 418, 424, 425, 428, 431, 448, 453, 462, 463, 472, 475, 476, 481, 484, 493, 510; ii. 31, 38, 74, 77, 78, 91, 184, 201, 214, 261, 273, 379, 380, 439, 499; iii. 341
Plautus, i. 204, 308; ii. 82
Pletho, i. 256, 261
Pliny, i. 151, 295, 368, 412, 465; ii. 70, 83, 110, 116, 163, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 196, 384, 385, 387, 473
Plotinus, ii. 78
Pluche, Abbé de la, i. 385; ii. 46, 83, 232, 244, 396
Plutarch, i. 81, 98, 133, 165, 167, 179, 180, 187, 194, 197, 207, 209, 210, 226, 231, 234, 238, 244, 246, 285, 337, 364, 371, 382, 384, 387, 391, 420, 421, 424, 426, 447, 453, 455, 458, 465, 473, 476, 484, 488, 489, 491, 495; ii. 7, 16, 21, 40, 42, 47, 68, 73, 77, 78, 81, 82, 176, 177, 187, 194, 197, 224, 237, 240, 241, 254, 263, 307, 364, 380, 391, 393, 395, 400; iii. 13, 249
Pococke, ii. 296, 367, 370; iii. 153
Polo, i. 396
Polybius, i. 180, 181, 408, 409, 426
Pompey, i. 152
Pomponatius, i. 123, 152, 190
Pomponius Mela, ii. 226
Pope, i. 171, 322; ii. 239, 275, 276, 385, 401
Porphyry, i. 178, 183, 184, 196, 197, 203, 207, 221, 231, 251, 252, 277, 293, 310, 381, 387, 388, 420, 423, 435, 489, 500; ii. 78, 191, 198, 200, 224, 233, 379, 391
Port-Royal, iii. 168
Posidonius, i. 152, 492
Prades, Abbé de, iii. 319, 320
Prætextatus, i. 224
Prideaux, ii. 205, 206, 234, 237, 241, 361, 362, 390, 392, 442; iii. 123, 245
Proclus, i. 198, 264; ii. 39, 195, 196, 391
Prodicus Chius, i. 385
Psellus, i. 273
Ptolemy, ii. 164
Puffendorf, i. 395
Purchas, ii. 174, 175, 198
Pythagoras, i. 299, 360, 428, 448, 449, 475, 476; ii. 78, 158, 191

Q

Quintilian, i. 176, 256, 436, 459, 460; ii. 118, 189, 380, 389, 392; iii. 217

R

Rabelais, ii. 46, 90
Ramsay, i. 493
Randolph, ii. 83
Reinesius, ii. 387
Renaudot, ii. 208
Rimius, iii. 171
Rogers, ii. 94
Romaine, ii. 104
Rousseau, ii. 3, 80
Rowe, i. 399
Ruæus, i. 279
Rubruquis, Father, i. 399
Rufinus, ii. 217
Rutherforth, ii. 491, 508; iii. 60, 61, 144, 192, 257, 290, 291, 298, 299

S

Sacheverell, ii. 85
Sallust, i. 426, 458, 474, 477
Salomo, ii. 97
Sanchoniatho, i. 212, 216, 387, 388, 489; ii. 30 32, 33, 34, 43, 176, 177, 197, 204, 221, 239, 362, 366, 367, 394, 402; iii. 379, 449
Sauvage, i. 184
Saxo-Grammaticus, i. 175; ii. 398
Scævola, i. 206, 416
Scaliger, i. 286, 258; ii. 256, 375, 499
Scarron, i. 84, 272
Schultens, iii. 93, 98, 105, 107, 279, 284
Scott, iii. 173, 185
Scribonius Largus, ii. 68
Selden, i. 139, 395; iii. 214
Seneca, i. 93, 116, 167, 270, 391, 425, 450, 457, 477, 487; ii. 29
Serranus, i. 510
Servetus, ii. 425
Servius, i. 250, 251, 260, 262, 265, 279, 284, 395, 440, 441, 442, 452; ii. 253, 365; iii. 128, 316
Settle, ii. 371
Severus, i. 287
Seward, i. 204
Sextus Empiricus, i. 146, 168, 431, 447, 484; ii. 37, 72, 73, 81, 82, 168
Shaftesbury, Lord, i. 82, 92, 96, 99, 100, 101, 104, 131, 315, 361, 362, 402, 411; ii. 13, 16, 320; iii. 46, 193, 295, 308, 314
Shakespeare, ii. 215, 385
Shaw, ii. 384, 391

Sheldon, iii. 433
Sheringham, i. 175; ii. 208
Sherlock, ii. 80, 88, 378, 479; iii. 45, 131, 153, 257, 315, 316, 319, 359, 425
Shuckford, ii. 157, 204, 337, 347, 362, 379, 382, 399, 403; iii. 52, 255, 374
Sibylline Oracles, i. 383
Silhouette, i. 385
Simon, Father, i. 387; ii. 373, 470, 471, 473, 478, 498; iii. 17
Smallbrooke, ii. 104
Smith, ii. 186, 321; iii. 225
Socinus, iii. 200
Socrates, i. 102, 220, 428, 429, 448, 449, 500; ii. 92, 138
Solomon, i. 278; ii. 500; iii. 14, 25
Sopater, i. 198, 205, 235, 246, 273
Sophocles, i. 167, 196, 199, 251, 259; ii. 447
Sotades, i. 293
Spencer, ii. 35, 146, 311, 312, 314, 329, 331, 332, 337, 344, 347, 358, 403, 410, 411, 412, 474; iii. 53, 54, 57, 89, 254, 450
Spinosa, i. 103, 151, 183; ii. 95, 318, 407, 435, 493, 505; iii. 6, 64, 66, 456, 459
Stahlenberg, ii. 175
Stanley, i. 380, 447, 455, 485; ii. 70, 381
Stebbing, ii. 96, 97, 105, 414, 512; iii. 14, 53, 64, 69, 71, 141, 145, 184, 185, 195, 257, 262, 290, 292, 293, 296, 297, 300, 304, 311, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319
Stephen, ii. 145, 316
Stillingfleet, ii. 195, 204, 205, 270, 362; iii. 245
Stobæus, i. 179, 180, 184, 189, 269, 278, 356, 447, 485, 487
Strabo, i. 177, 180, 193, 195, 210, 216, 232, 251, 281, 283, 294, 371, 403, 411, 412, 420, 423, 426, 453, 485, 489; ii. 67, 154, 155, 156, 158, 194, 196, 235, 256, 364, 366, 384
Suarez, iii. 320
Suetonius, i. 198, 224, 246, 254, 359, 393, 397, 398
Suidas, i. 181, 218, 220, 494, 496; ii. 392
Swift, i. 83, 119, 338
Sykes, i. 466; ii. 69, 489; iii. 34, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 213, 219, 257, 290, 318, 354, 472
Symmachus, i. 364
Syncellus, i. 257, 258, 392; ii. 163
Synesius, i. 200, 417, 458; iii. 474
Syrianus, i. 200

T

Tachard, i. 399
Tacitus, i. 233, 264, 359, 367, 368, 369, 375; ii. 24, 110, 111, 184, 195, 196, 237, 244, 253, 307, 365, 366, 384, 395, 397
Tanaquil Faber, iii. 217
Tanchum, Rabbi, ii. 150
Tasso, i. 310
Tatian, i. 483, 494; ii. 386, 387
Tavernier, i. 339
Taylor, ii. 110
Taylor of Norwich, iii. 26
Teles, i. 447
Temple, Sir W., i. 175
Tenison, ii. 107
Terence, i. 143, 199, 204, 396, 494
Tertullian, i. 198, 201, 218, 226, 251, 256, 261, 398, 400, 483, 502, 503; ii. 39, 117, 120
Themistius, i. 258, 273, 365, 416; ii. 68
Theodoret, i. 194, 226, 231, 391; ii. 204
Theodorus, i. 151, 441
Theophilus, i. 388
Theophrastus, i. 175, 180, 417; ii. 19
Theopompus, i. 441, 442
Thomas, St., iii. 320
Thoth, i. 498
Thrasyllus, ii. 204
Thuanus, iii. 476
Thucydides, i. 387; iii. 104
Tibullus, i. 231
Timæus, i. 180, 181, 182, 231, 407, 426, 445, 446
Tindal, i. 88, 113, 128, 338, 509; ii. 95, 139, 376, 377, 406, 435, 509; iii. 6, 9, 64, 175, 196, 260, 448
Toland, i. 113, 128, 338, 420, 424, 490; ii. 1, 27, 28, 29, 40, 493, 509; iii. 26
Tournemine, ii. 478
Trajan, ii. 117, 132
Trismegist. See *Hermes*.
Trogus Pompeius, ii. 363
Turnebus, i. 190; ii. 380
Turner, ii. 107
Tzetzes, i. 270, 273

U

Usher, ii. 375

V

Valla, i. 380
Vanini, i. 151; iii. 61
Varro, i. 201, 205, 221, 384, 416, 434, 459, 466; ii. 25
Velleius, i. 398, 483, 484
Velleius Paterculus, i. 385, 393, 441; iii. 277
Velly, Abbé, i. 394
Venn, ii. 105
Victor, Aurelius, i. 224
Victorius, i. 224, 250, 388
Vigerus, ii. 177
Virgil, i. 189, 229, 235, 249, 252, 260, 262, 269, 287, 310, 388, 389, 394, 440, 441, 442, 496; ii. 77, 365; iii. 215, 216, 219, 222, 245, 316, 455
Vitruvius, i. 281; ii. 375
Vizzanius, i. 381, 382
Voltaire, i. 155, 217, 241, 400; ii. 67, 361, 421, 425, 429; iii. 66, 434, 451, 455, 456, 458, 461, 463
Vossius, ii. 41, 233; iii. 151

W

Walker, ii. 187
Walter, i. 406
Waterland, ii. 105, 106, 329; iii. 254, 359
Webster, ii. 104, 105, 106, 107
Wheatley, ii. 407
Whiston, ii. 411, 497, 498; iii. 58, 68, 145, 205, 225, 226, 315, 359
Whitby, ii. 499
Wilkins, ii. 365
William of Newbourg, iii. 241
Winkelman, i. 226; ii. 394
Witsius, ii. 312, 314, 325, 329, 335, 351, 410, 412; iii. 254
Wollaston, i. 140, 344
Wood, Anthony, ii. 79
Woolston, i. 82
"World," ii. 370
Wycherley, i. 82

X

Xenophon, i. 425, 428, 431, 449

Z

Zabara, ii. 97
Zacynthus, i. 420
Zaleucus, i. 185–190, 382; iii. 113
Zechariah, ii. 189, 300, 476, 503; iii. 2, 100, 103, 111, 112, 113, 121, 127
Zeno, i. 134, 425, 455
Zephaniah, ii. 64, 507; iii. 96, 227
Zeuxis, ii. 418
Zinzendorf, Count, iii. 171
Zophar, iii. 86
Zoroaster, i. 258, 274
Zosimus, i. 195, 224; ii. 128

THE END.

LONDON:—PRINTED BY JAMES NICHOLS, HOXTON-SQUARE.

JORTIN'S (JOHN, D.D.) SERMONS ON DIFFERENT SUBJECTS; also Doctrine of a Future State; and Four Charges, 4 vols. 8vo. cloth, 7s. 6d.

JORTIN'S REMARKS ON ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, 14s.

KING'S (DR. DAVID) NEW AND COMPLETE CONCORDANCE, on the basis of Cruden, post 8vo. cloth, 5s.

LATROBE'S SCRIPTURE ILLUSTRATIONS,
A Series of 84 Engravings illustrative of the Bible, 4to. cloth, 15s.

LELAND'S (DR. JOHN) DIVINE AUTHORITY OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS, 8vo. cloth, 5s.

LO

LO

LU S,

LY :
h, 4s. 6d.

MA

MI ANITY,

MO ES,

MO ND ST.

MO

MO L HIS-
vised and
cloth, 8s.

NE E PRO-

OR

PA KS.
royal 8vo.

PA VMAN,
vo. cloth,

PE CREED,

Date Due

11/7/55			
12-13-74			

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

W. Tegg & Co., 85, Queen Street, Cheapside, London.

PITMAN'S (REV. J. R.) SERMONS,
Course of Sermons for the Year, 4 vols. 8vo. cloth, 15s.

PRIDEAUX'S CONNEXION ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. New Edition, by J. Talboys Wheeler, 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, 14s.

RELIGIOUS EMBLEMS AND ALLEGORIES.
A Series of Engravings designed to illustrate Divine Truth, by the Rev. W. Holmes, fcp. 8vo. antique cloth, red edges, 5s.

ROBINSON'S ORIENTAL ILLUSTRATIONS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, 8vo. cloth, 5s.

ROBINSON'S (REV. THOS.) SCRIPTURE CHARACTERS, 8vo. cloth, 8s.

SHUCKFORD'S (SAMUEL, M.A.) SACRED AND PROFANE HISTORY OF THE WORLD CONNECTED, from the Creation, &c., by J. Talboys Wheeler, 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, 14s.

STUART'S (MOSES) CRITICAL HISTORY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT CANON, New Edition, by the Rev. Dr. Lorimer, 8vo. cloth, 5s.

STUART'S (MOSES) COMMENTARIES.
On the Apocalypse, 8vo. cloth, 7s. 6d. On the Hebrews, 8vo. cloth, 7s. 6d. On the Romans, 7s. 6d.

TOWNSEND'S (GEORGE, D.D.) ECCLESIASTICAL AND CIVIL HISTORY, 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, 12s.

WARBURTON'S DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES,
3 vols. 8vo. cloth, 18s.

WARDEN'S (REV. J., M.A.) SYSTEM OF REVEAL
RELIGION, 8vo. cloth, 7s. 6d.

WELLS'S (DR. E.) GEOGRAPHY OF THE OL
NEW TESTAMENTS, 8vo. cloth, 8s.

WESLEY'S SERMONS ON SEVERAL OCCA
With Memoir by Samuel Drew, M.A., 2 vols. 8vo. cl

WHEATLY ON THE BOOK OF CO
8vo. cloth, 4s. 6d.

WHITEFIELD'S SERMONS ON I
With Memoir by Samuel Drew, M.A.,

WILLIAMS'S CHRISTIAN P
With Appendix on the Choice o

WOOD'S (REV. JAME
BIBLE, forming a com
Divinity, &c., 2 vols. 8

W. Tegg & C

DOES NOT CIRCULATE